



ATTACHMENT 1

EXCERPTS FROM THE 2005-06 CONSOLIDATED GRANTS GUIDELINES APPLICABLE TO THE 319(h) NPS GRANT PROGRAM

I. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.....	1
A. PROJECT TIMING, PROGRAM FUND LIMITS, & MATCH REQUIREMENTS	1
i. Maximum Grant Amounts & Minimum Grant Amounts	1
ii. Funding Match Requirements	1
iii. Funding Match Waiver/Reduction.....	2
B. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS	2
C. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS	3
D. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE	3
II. PRIORITIES AND PROGRAM PREFERENCES.....	3
III. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION, REVIEW, & SELECTION PROCESS	4
A. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF CONCEPT PROPOSALS	4
B. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF FULL PROPOSALS	4
C. APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	5
D. COMPLETENESS REVIEW	5
E. ELIGIBILITY REVIEW	5
F. REVIEW AND SCORING PROCESS.....	6
i. Concept Proposal	6
ii. Full Proposal.....	7
G. APPLICANT NOTIFICATION	8
H. FUNDING AWARDS	8
I. GRANT AGREEMENT	8
J. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS	9
IV. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.....	9
A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST	9
B. CONFIDENTIALITY	9
C. CEQA COMPLIANCE	9
D. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN CONSISTENCY	9
E. RELATED LITIGATION	10
F. PROJECT ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION PLANS	10
G. MONITORING & REPORTING	10
H. DATA MANAGEMENT	11
I. MODIFICATION OF A RIVER OR STREAM CHANNEL.....	11
J. GRANT MANAGER NOTIFICATION	11
APPENDIX A - 2008 319 (h) NPS Grant Program Summary Table.....	12
APPENDIX B - Useful Web Links.....	13
APPENDIX C - Not Applicable	15
APPENDIX D - Requests for Waiver or Reduction of Funding Match for Disadvantaged Communities.....	16
APPENDIX E - Definitions	22
APPENDIX F - Required Elements for Watershed-Based Plans per CWA Section 319.....	28
APPENDIX G - Statewide, Regional and Partner Agency Priorities.....	30
APPENDIX H - Concept Proposal Application and Evaluation Criteria.....	31
APPENDIX I - Full Proposal Submittal Requirements & Evaluation Criteria	39
EXHIBIT I-1 – Eligible Applicant Documentation	43
APPENDIX K - Environmental Review Process.....	70
APPENDIX L - Preparing Project Assessment and Evaluation Plans	73

I. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Complete applications will be evaluated for compliance with the eligibility requirements during the Concept and Full Proposal phases. Eligibility is based on program funding limits, project timing, match requirements, applicant type, and project type. Proposals that do not meet the eligibility requirements will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

A. PROJECT TIMING, PROGRAM FUND LIMITS, & MATCH REQUIREMENTS

The project timing, maximum and minimum grant amounts, and the minimum match requirements are presented below.

Table 1 – Project Timing, Maximum and Minimum Grant Amounts, and Match Requirements

Grant Program	Project Timing*	Maximum Grant Amount	Minimum Grant Amount	Minimum Match Requirement¹
319 (h) Nonpoint Source Implementation Grant Program [319 (h) NPS Grant Program]	Grant Agreement Finalized by: No later than June 30, 2010 Project Grant End Date: No later than June 30, 2013 Final Project Report: No later than June 1, 2013 Final Invoicing: No later than Sept. 1, 2013	\$1,000,000	\$250,000	25%
¹ The match requirement may be waived or reduced for projects that directly benefit a disadvantaged community(ies) as outlined in Appendix D . * These Dates may be subject to change.				

Maximum Grant Amounts & Minimum Grant Amounts

The minimum and maximum grant amounts are based on input from stakeholders, California Water Boards staff, and partner agency representatives.

Funding Match Requirements

The applicant is required to provide a funding match. “Funding match” means funds made available by the applicant from non-State sources. The funding match may include, but is not limited to, Federal funds, local funding, or donated and volunteer services from non-State sources. A State agency may use State funds and services for the funding match. The funding match is calculated based on total project cost for which funding is requested.

Eligible reimbursable expenses incurred after August 8, 2008 and prior to the project completion date can be applied to the funding match. Education and outreach that is a component of a project funded through federally funded NPS Implementation Program is an eligible reimbursable expense. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) reserves the discretion to review and approve funding match expenditures.

Funding Match Waiver/Reduction

The funding match requirement may be waived or reduced for disadvantaged communities upon request. Proposals submitted by a disadvantaged community or disadvantaged community-based organization that serves the disadvantaged community may be eligible for a funding match waiver. Proposals that directly benefit a disadvantaged community may be eligible for a funding match reduction. Reductions in the required funding match percentage will be in proportion to the percentage of the disadvantaged community population directly benefiting from the project relative to the entire population in the project/planning area. The applicant will be required to document that representatives of the disadvantaged community have been or will be involved in the planning and/or implementation process and that project implementation or implementation of the local watershed management plan will provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged community.

[Appendix D](#) (Requests for Waiver or Reduction of Funding Match for Disadvantaged Communities) provides more detail on the procedures for requesting a waiver or reduction of the required funding match. State Water Board staff will review and make the final determination on funding match waiver or reduction eligibility.

B. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

The eligible applicants for this program are defined in statute. The eligible applicants and associated reference code sections are provided in TABLE 2.

Table 2 – Eligible Applicants

Eligible Applicants¹	319 (h) NPS Grant Program (CWA, Section 319(h))
Local Public Agencies	X
Public Agencies	X
Public Colleges	X
501(c)(3) Nonprofit Organizations	X
Indian Tribes²	X
State Agencies	X ³
Federal Agencies	X ³
¹ Definitions of the eligible applicants are presented in Appendix E . ² Limited to federally recognized tribes. To receive grant funds, tribes must waive their sovereign immunity with respect to the project and grant agreement. ³ Applicants eligible if collaborating with local entities involved in watershed management or if proposing a statewide project.	

C. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Eligible projects for the 319(h) NPS Grant Program are listed below. Eligible project requirements are established by law, unless otherwise stated.

Education and outreach that is a component of an implementation project funded through the 319 (h) NPS Grant Program is eligible for funding. For a discussion of the match requirements associated with education and outreach activities, refer to [Section I.A.ii](#) of this Attachment 1.

Eligible projects under the 319 (h) NPS Grant Program:

- ❖ Must implement activities that contribute to the restoration of NPS impaired waters through reduced pollutant loads as called for in an existing TMDL or a TMDL that is substantially under development. (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/tmdl.shtml)
- ❖ Must implement activities that are part of watershed plans that address the USEPA nine required watershed-based plan elements. Guidance on the Required Elements for Watershed-Based Plans, per CWA Section 319, is provided in [Appendix F](#).
- ❖ Must ensure the continued proper operation and maintenance of all management practices that have been implemented in accordance with National Resource Conservation Service's Field Office Technical Guides (see [Appendix B](#)) or other appropriate standards.

D. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

Proposals from throughout California will be considered for this funding program.

II. PRIORITIES AND PROGRAM PREFERENCES

The State Water Board is making CWA Section 319 funds available through this 2008 Solicitation aimed at implementing actions to restore impaired surface waters through the control of nonpoint source (NPS) pollution.

The State Water Board seeks to fund projects that will serve as models for water quality improvement. Ideal model projects demonstrate the creative use of various funding sources, programs and authorities to achieve water quality improvements while building sustainable watershed partnerships for ongoing stewardship. This recognizes that water quality goals will most likely be achieved through multiple diverse efforts, as opposed to a single grant funded project.

Proposals most likely to receive funding must successfully demonstrate the following:

- ❖ Well planned and designed implementation activities that have a high likelihood of contributing to the desired water quality improvements based on data and information contained in TMDLs and watershed plans;
- ❖ Significant pollutant load reductions that contribute to the restoration of a nonpoint source impaired 303(d) listed water body. Restoration refers to the attainment of water quality objectives and beneficial uses, ultimately resulting in delisting;
- ❖ Achievement of water quality objectives and beneficial uses within a specified time-period. Projects demonstrating short-term results (e.g., 5 years) will be preferred, but longer-term results will also be supported.

This 2008 Solicitation for the CWA Section 319 NPS funds will support the preferences listed here and the nonpoint source related projects that address the priorities in [Appendix G](#) of the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Guidelines. [Appendix G](#) contains State, Regional and Partner Agency priorities for funding for all of the grant programs included in that previous solicitation.

It is critical that you contact the Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or USEPA representative as you develop your proposal to ensure it meets eligibility requirements, the program preferences listed above and the priorities ([Appendix G](#) of the 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Guidelines).

III. PROPOSAL SOLICITATION, REVIEW, & SELECTION PROCESS

The 319 (h) NPS Grant Program will follow a two-step solicitation process: 1) Concept Proposals (CPs); and 2) Full Proposals (FPs). The solicitation process, review process, and selection process are described below. Proposal content requirements and review criteria are included in the Appendices.

A. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF CONCEPT PROPOSALS

Requirements for the CP Submittal can be found in the Solicitation notice. The CP application will consist of an on-line application submitted using the State Water Board's FFAST system. The CP and evaluation criteria are presented in [Appendix H](#). The on-line FFAST application for the CP can be found at the following secure link:

<https://faast.waterboards.ca.gov/>

All applications, including attachments and supporting documentation, must be provided by the submittal deadline. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

B. SOLICITATION & SUBMITTAL OF FULL PROPOSALS

Solicitation for FPs will be by invitation to applicants with the highest ranking CPs. The FP review process will also be competitive since the number of CPs invited back will exceed the total available funding. The FP Solicitation Notice will include information on the due date and time for FP submittals, and will provide detailed instructions on the mechanics of submitting the FP. Applicants will be invited to submit detailed FPs using the FFAST system.

The FP will allow the applicant to expand upon the CP submitted previously, provide the detail needed for the State Water Board to make a final funding decision, and also allow for an expedited grant agreement process. An expedited grant agreement process is achieved through the submission of a detailed, concise, and specific scope of work that will be used for preparing the grant agreement should the project be selected for funding ([Appendix I](#)).

Applications must include all required elements in the FP Solicitation Notice. All applications, including attachments and supporting documentation, must be provided by the submittal deadline. Any material submitted after the deadline will not be reviewed or considered for funding.

Applications may include attachments with supplemental materials such as design plans and specifications, detailed cost estimates, feasibility studies, pilot projects, additional maps, geographic information system (GIS) shape files, diagrams, letters of support, copies of agreements, or other applicable items. All supporting documentation will be requested in an electronic format through FAAST, unless specified otherwise. Details on what information will be required and FP evaluation criteria are presented in [Appendix I](#).

C. APPLICANT ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS

One or more technical assistance workshops will be conducted throughout California to address questions and to provide general assistance to applicants in preparing their CPs. California Water Boards staff will also conduct workshops on proposal development for applicants invited to submit FPs. The dates and locations of the CP and FP workshops will be provided on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/319h/index.shtml

In addition to the informational workshops, applicants are encouraged to seek assistance from staff of State Water Board, Regional Water Boards, and USEPA in understanding the funding priorities, applicable program requirements, and completing grant applications. Agency contacts are listed in Attachment 2 of this Solicitation Notice.

D. COMPLETENESS REVIEW

CP applications must contain all required items listed in the CP Solicitation Notice. FPs must contain all required information in the FP Solicitation Notice. Each CP and FP application will first be evaluated and screened for completeness. Applications not containing all required information will not be reviewed or considered for funding, and applicants will be notified.

E. ELIGIBILITY REVIEW

Complete applications will be evaluated for compliance with eligibility criteria during the CP and FP phases. All proposals must meet the eligible applicant requirements in [Section I.B](#), eligible project requirements in [Section I.C](#), and the priorities and program preferences in [Section II](#). The CP Eligibility Review Sheet is presented in [Appendix H](#). The FP eligibility review information is presented in [Appendix I](#). Applications that are determined to be ineligible will not be reviewed or considered for funding, and applicants will be notified.

F. REVIEW AND SCORING PROCESS

Concept Proposal

All CPs must be submitted in FFAST by the posted date and time deadline. As the CPs arrive in FFAST, the CPs will be assigned to State Water Board staff for completeness and eligibility review. As part of this review, State Water Board staff will recommend the agencies that should review and score the eligible CPs based on the project type and funding source. The reviewer assignments will be made as presented below.

- ❖ Regional Water Boards staff to review CPs for all projects located in their region. If a project encompasses multiple regions, staff in the corresponding Regional Water Boards to review the CP.
- ❖ State Water Board staff to review CPs that meet a State Water Board priority. State Water Board staff may review additional CPs based on availability of staff resources.
- ❖ USEPA staff to review every CP that applies for NPS Implementation Program (Clean Water Act, Section 319(h)) or TMDL implementation projects.
- ❖ Additional reviews will be accommodated if a request is made with sufficient notice.

Each CP will be scored by at least three reviewers using the FFAST system. All eligible CPs will be scored based on technical feasibility, ability to address the identified priorities, readiness to proceed, and other criteria outlined in the Concept Proposal Evaluation: Scoring Criteria form ([Appendix H](#)).

Reviewer scores will be averaged in FFAST. State Water Board staff will review the scores for consistency among review results and as needed, may contact reviewers to resolve inconsistencies or disregard an outlier score in determining the average score for a CP. Additionally, as time and resources allow, an effort will be made to include additional reviews of CPs where outlier scores were disregarded. Once the scores are averaged, State Water Board staff will generate a list for the grant program sorting, the CPs from high to low based on the final averaged scores. State Water Board staff will group the CPs on the list into three categories:

- ❖ Invite Applicant Back to Submit FP;
- ❖ Applicant Not Invited to Submit FP; and
- ❖ Ineligible CP Submittal.

Applicants who submitted the most competitive eligible CPs will be invited to submit FPs to a level of at least 125 percent of the available grant funds.

This list will be distributed to the Regional Water Boards, and USEPA for review. The list will be posted on the State Water Board's Division of Financial Assistance website ([Appendix B](#)) and notification e-mails will be sent to all applicants.

CP scores will be used to select the most competitive projects and to determine whether an applicant should be invited to submit a FP. At the FP stage, proposals will be evaluated and scored based on the information provided in the FP and the expertise of the reviewers, without regard to the CP score. However, the FPs will be evaluated for consistency with what was submitted in the CP and major changes to the scope of work may disqualify the proposal.

Full Proposal

FPs will be evaluated by the following two groups: (1) Technical Review Teams; and (2) Selection Panel. The role, makeup, and purpose of each group are outlined below.

Technical Review Teams – All complete and eligible FPs will be evaluated and scored by technical review teams. Technical review team members will individually score FPs in accordance with the evaluation criteria presented in [Appendix I](#). Technical review teams will be comprised of subject matter experts from the State Water Board, Regional Water Boards, and U.S. EPA. The State Water Board will seek non-agency subject matter experts (e.g., from nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, etc.) that are interested in being part of technical review teams for FPs. Statements of qualifications will be required. Reviewers will not be able to review or participate in discussion of proposals for which they have a conflict of interest. All reviewers will be required to submit a statement disclosing any conflict of interest. State Water Board staff in consultation with staffs from Regional Water Boards and U.S. EPA will select reviewers for each technical review team.

Each review team will be comprised of at least three technical reviewers who will evaluate and score each eligible FP. Technical review teams will be formed based on the “Project Type” categories outlined in the CP. Technical reviewers within each team will review all FPs in a “Project Type” group. For example, all FPs with an “Erosion and/or Sediment Control” focus will be reviewed by the “Erosion and/or Sediment Control” review team. Additional technical review teams may be identified as needed based on the number of proposals received and project type. If Regional Water Boards do not have adequate resources to do a complete review of all FPs within their region, they may choose to provide comments instead.

Each FP will be evaluated and scored based on the information the applicant provides in FAAST. Previous knowledge, conversations, or outside information that is not provided in the FP will not be used to evaluate and score FPs. However, an applicant's past performance and track record may be taken into consideration.

Following completion of the individual technical reviews, the technical review team will discuss the FPs, to arrive at a final evaluation and score for each proposal. Based on the final scores, FPs will be compiled into a preliminary ranked list. The ranked lists will be sent out to Regional Water Boards staff and technical review team members for review and comment. The scope of the review and comments will be limited to errors and/or inconsistencies in compiling the ranked list.

Selection Panel – The State Water Board will convene a Selection Panel to review the preliminary ranking list, technical scores, and reviewer comments. If a technical review team has not reached a final score on any proposal, the Selection Panel will determine a final score based on individual reviewer comments. If there is a disparity in the scores or concerns from the technical reviewers, the Selection Panel will consider them and may revise the scores as appropriate. The Selection Panel may also adjust final scores for the proposals to ensure that evaluation criteria have been consistently applied.

The Selection Panel will be comprised of one representative identified by management from the following agencies:

- ❖ State Water Board, Regional Water Boards and U.S. EPA

The Selection Panel will make initial funding recommendations, considering the following items:

- ❖ Final review and score;
- ❖ Program Preferences ([Section II of this document](#)); and
- ❖ Amount of funds available for the grant program.

The Selection Panel will prepare the final recommended funding list for presentation to the State Water Board for adoption. The Selection Panel may recommend reducing individual grant amounts from the requested amount. However, such reductions will be considered only if technical reviewers have indicated in their review comments that the budget is too high or some tasks are not necessary. A reduction would also be weighed against whether the reduced funding would impede project implementation.

G. APPLICANT NOTIFICATION

The list of proposals recommended for funding will be posted on the State Water Board website <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/319h.html> and applicants will be notified of the availability of the recommended funding list. Prior to State Water Board adoption, applicants will be provided with their evaluation results and will be given the opportunity to provide comments on any errors related to review of their proposals.

H. FUNDING AWARDS

The State Water Board will consider adoption of the funding recommendations developed by the Selection Panel at a State Water Board meeting. Following approval by the State Water Board, the selected applicants will be notified.

I. GRANT AGREEMENT

Although the grant solicitation and selection process is implemented by the State Water Board, the grant agreement oversight will be coordinated between the State Water Board and the Regional Water Boards depending on the scope of the proposal.

Following funding awards, the State Water Board will execute a grant agreement with the grantee. Grant agreements are not executed until signed by authorized representatives of the grantee and the State Water Board. A copy of a Grant Agreement Template will be available on the State Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/319h/index.shtml

State Water Board encourages collaboration in the development and implementation of projects. Parties that wish to collaborate on a proposal may elect to use a contractor-subcontractor relationship, a joint venture, a joint powers authority, or other appropriate mechanism. Grant agreements will be executed with one eligible grantee per project. This grantee can subcontract with partners that are responsible for implementation of the component projects. The grant funding and the implementation responsibilities will be the province of the grantee. The State Water Board will not have a funding relationship with collaborators.

Non-responsiveness has been an issue with a handful of past grant recipients. Such non-responsiveness slows down the funding process. In several cases, non-responsiveness has resulted in grant funds being left unused for a substantial and unwarranted amount of time and has

caused the termination of grant agreements. For this reason, lack of responsiveness prior to finalizing and executing a grant agreement may result in withdrawal of the grant award. These funds will be made available to other competitive proposals that were below the funding line at the time of the State Water Board awards.

J. REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

Reimbursable costs are defined in [Appendix E](#). Only direct costs related to the project are allowed. Only work performed within the terms of the grant agreement will be eligible for reimbursement. Education and outreach that is a component of a project funded through the federally funded NPS Implementation Program is an eligible reimbursable expense. **Advance funds will not be provided. Funding match requirements are discussed in Section I.A.ii.**

IV. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

All participants are subject to State and Federal conflict of interest laws. Failure to comply with these laws, including business and financial disclosure provisions, will result in the application being rejected and any subsequent grant agreement being declared void. Other legal action may also be taken. Before submitting an application, applicants are urged to seek legal counsel regarding conflict of interest requirements. Applicable statutes include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 1090, California Public Contract Code Sections 10410 and 10411.

B. CONFIDENTIALITY

Once the proposal has been submitted to State Water Board, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections afforded by law with respect to the application package will be waived.

C. CEQA COMPLIANCE

All projects funded under the 319(h) NPS Grant Program must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (PRC § 21000 *et seq.*) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). See [Appendix B](#) for links to CEQA information and the State Clearinghouse Handbook.

Grantees are responsible for complying with all applicable laws and regulations for their projects, including CEQA and NEPA, if applicable. State Water Board selection of a project for a grant does not foreclose appropriate consideration of alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate adverse environmental effects of that project during the CEQA review process. No work that is subject to CEQA and/or NEPA may proceed until clearance is given by the State Water Board, a responsible agency. Details about the State Water Board's environmental review process can be found in [Appendix K](#).

D. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN CONSISTENCY

Any watershed protection activities must be consistent with the applicable, adopted, local watershed management plans and the applicable Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) adopted by a Regional Water Board, where plans exist. See [Appendix B](#) for web links to the Basin Plans. (CWC, Section 79507) Watershed protection activities in the San Gabriel and Los Angeles

watersheds must be consistent with the San Gabriel and Los Angeles River Watershed and Open Space Plan as adopted by the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountain Conservancy and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. (CWC, Section 79508)

E. RELATED LITIGATION

Grant agreements funded by the State Water Board will specify the following:

Under no circumstances may a Grantee use funds from any disbursement under this Grant Agreement to pay costs associated with any litigation the Grantee pursues against the State Water Resources Control Board or any Regional Water Quality Control Board. Regardless of the outcome of any such litigation, and notwithstanding any conflicting language in this agreement, the Grantee agrees to complete the Project funded by this agreement or to repay all of the grant funds plus interest.

F. PROJECT ASSESSMENT & EVALUATION PLANS

All FPs must include the performance measure tables that form the basis of the Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan (PAEP) to summarize how project performance will be assessed, evaluated, and reported. The goals of the PAEP are to:

- ❖ Provide a framework for assessment and evaluation of project performance;
- ❖ Identify measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving project goals and desired outcomes;
- ❖ Provide a tool for grantees and grant managers to monitor and measure project progress and guide final project performance reporting that will fulfill the grant agreement requirements;
- ❖ Provide information to help improve current and future projects; and
- ❖ Quantify the value of public expenditures to achieve environmental results.

The PAEP will be submitted after the grant agreement is executed and will include a summary of project goals, the desired project outcomes, the appropriate performance measures to track the project progress, and measurable targets that the applicant thinks are feasible to meet during the project period. The PAEP is not intended to be a monitoring plan. PAEP guidance is presented in [Appendix L](#).

G. MONITORING & REPORTING

All projects affecting water quality must include a monitoring component that, where applicable, allows integration of data into statewide monitoring efforts, including the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) and/or the Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program. Both programs include data quality assurance and quality control requirements. Projects that include water quality monitoring must include development of an appropriate monitoring plan, Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), and tasks. For surface water monitoring, the QAPP must be prepared in accordance with the SWAMP QAPP template, which is available on-line at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/

Projects funded through the federally funded NPS Implementation Program (CWA, Section 319[h]) must comply with specific requirements that include reporting project geo-location, nutrient and sediment load reductions or estimates, best management practices to be implemented, and annual rainfall data. Geo-locations of the project, but not individual management measures or practices implemented, must be reported at the stream reach level, which also includes information on lakes and other water bodies. The stream reaches identified should not be every reach downstream of the project that may potentially receive benefits for the project, but only those reaches that the project directly benefits.

Projects must include the development and submittal of progress reports and a final report. The proposals should identify the frequency of progress report submittal.

H. DATA MANAGEMENT

Projects must include appropriate data management activities so that project data can be incorporated into appropriate statewide data systems. Project-generated data will be available to the stakeholders, agencies, and the public in the California Water Boards files. Web links to additional information on the State Water Board's statewide data management efforts are provided in [Appendix B](#).

I. MODIFICATION OF A RIVER OR STREAM CHANNEL

Projects that include modification of a river or stream channel must fully mitigate environmental impacts resulting from the modification. The applicant must provide documentation that the environmental impacts resulting from such modification will be fully mitigated considering all of the impacts of the modification and any mitigation, environmental enhancement, and environmental benefit resulting from the project, and whether, on balance, any environmental enhancement or benefit equals or exceeds any negative environmental impacts of the project. (CWC § 79560 and § 79560.1(b))

J. GRANT MANAGER NOTIFICATION

Grantees will be required to notify California Water Boards staff prior to conducting construction, monitoring, demonstration, or other implementation activities so that California Water Boards staff may observe to verify activities are conducted in accordance with the grant agreement. California Water Boards staff may document the inspection with photographs or notes, which may be included in the project file.

APPENDIX A

2008 319 (H) NPS GRANT PROGRAM SUMMARY TABLE

Appendix A: 2008 319(h) NPS Grant Program			
319 (h) NPS Grant Program	Eligible Applicants	Eligible Projects	Available Funding and Schedule
<p><u>Purpose:</u> Projects that control activities that impair beneficial uses and that limit pollutant effects caused by those activities.</p> <p>(State Water Board, Regional Water Boards, and USEPA</p> <p>Federal Clean Water Act Section 319 (h)</p>	<p>a. Local Public Agencies</p> <p>b. Public Agencies</p> <p>c. Nonprofit Organizations (501[c][3])</p> <p>d. Federally Recognized Indian Tribes</p> <p>e. State Agenciesⁱ</p> <p>f. Public Colleges</p> <p>g. Federal Agenciesⁱ</p>	<p>Eligible projects under the NPS Implementation Program (CWA, Section 319(h)) are projects that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Must implement <u>activities that contribute to the restoration of NPS impaired waters through reduced pollutant loads as called for in an existing TMDL or a TMDL that is substantially under development.</u> (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/tmdl/tmdl.html) 2. Must implement activities that are part of watershed plans that address the USEPA nine required watershed-based plan elements. Guidance on the Required Elements for Watershed-Based Plans, per CWA Section 319, is provided in Appendix F. 3. Ensure the continued proper operation and maintenance of all management practices that have been implemented in accordance with National Resource Conservation Service's Field Office Technical Guides (see Appendix B) or other appropriate standards. 	<p>Approximate Total = \$4.5 million based on annual federal appropriation</p> <p>Grant Project Maximum - \$1,000,000</p> <p>Grant Project Minimum - \$250,000</p> <p>Grant Agreement finalized by: No later than June 30, 2010*</p> <p>Project Grant End Date: No later than June 30, 2013*</p> <p>Final Project Report: No later than June 1, 2013*</p> <p>Final Invoicing: No later than Sept. 1, 2013*</p>

* These Dates may be subject to change.

APPENDIX B

USEFUL WEB LINKS

CEQA Information

Environmental Information: <http://ceres.ca.gov/index.html>
California State Clearinghouse Handbook: http://www.opr.ca.gov/planning/PDFs/sch_handbook.pdf
CEQA Guidelines: http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/

California Water Code (CWC) <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=wat&codebody=&hits=20>

California Watershed Portal <http://cwp.casil.ucdavis.edu/>

Department of Industrial Relations <http://www.dir.ca.gov/>

Environmental Justice http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/outreach/education/justice.shtml

Environmental Justice Coalition for Water <http://www.ejcw.org>

Environmental Justice Program (USEPA's) <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/environmentaljustice/index.html>

MOU between Cal/EPA and Resources Agency http://cwp.resources.ca.gov/uploads/images/53/MOU_watershed.pdf

Natural Resources Conservation Services Technical Resources <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical>

Performance Assessment and Evaluation Plan Websites

Project Planning, Research, Monitoring, and Assessment (many of these resources also apply to BMP implementation or habitat restoration effectiveness monitoring)

<http://cwam.ucdavis.edu/>
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/volunteer.html>
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/qapp.shtml
<http://www.epa.gov/watertrain>
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/cabw/csbp_2003.pdf
<http://www.wrmp.org/cram.html>
<http://www.calfish.org/DesktopDefault.aspx?tabId=112>
http://www.cnr.berkeley.edu/forestry/comp_proj/DFG/Monitoring%20the%20Implementation%20and%20Effectiveness%20of%20Fisheries.pdf

Education and Outreach

http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,%207-135-3313_3682_3714-75944--,00.html
http://cecommerce.uwex.edu/pdfs/G3658_10.PDF

Pollutant Load Reduction Activities

<http://it.tetratex-ffx.com/step/>
<http://www.sfei.org/watersheds/reports/GuadalupeYear1final.pdf>
<http://www.sccwrp.org/pubs/annrpt/96/ar-04.htm>

Habitat Restoration

<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nafwb/manual.html>
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nafwb/pubs.html>
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/hcpb/species/stds_gdl/survmonitr.shtml
<http://www.epa.gov/watertrain>

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/publications_forms/
<http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/protocols/OFR-93-408/habit1.html>

PAEP Tools and Project Performance Measures Tables

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/paep/index.shtml

Public Resources Code (PRC) <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=prc>

Regional Water Boards Watershed Management Initiative Chapters

Region 1: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/watermanageinit.html>
Region 2: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/watershedmanagement.htm>
Region 3: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/WMI/WMI_2002_Final_Document_Revised_1-22-02.pdf
Region 4: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/html/programs/regional_programs.html#Watershed
Region 5: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/available_documents/watershed/R5_WMI_chapter.html
Region 6: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/WMI/WMI_Index.htm
Region 7: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/wmi.html>
Region 8: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/html/wmi.html>
Region 9: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/programs/wmc.html>

Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans)

Region 1: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/basinplan/basin.html>
Region 2: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basinplan.shtml>
Region 3: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/BasinPlan/Index.htm>
Region 4: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/plnspols/index.html>
Region 5: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/
Region 6: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/
Region 7: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/coloradoriver/water_issues/programs/basin_planning/
Region 8: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml
Region 9: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/

State Water Board Program Information

2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/consolidgrants0506.html>
303d List: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/303d_lists.shtml
Critical Coastal Areas Program: <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-nps.html>
California Ocean Plan: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/plnspols/oplans/index.html>
Division of Financial Assistance: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/319h/index.shtml
Groundwater Monitoring: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/>
NPS Plan: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/5yrplan.html>
NPS Program: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/nps/protecting.html>
Stormwater Program: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/
TMDL List: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/docs/tmdlolist.doc>
Watershed Action Plan Outline: <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/cca-plan-outline.pdf>
USEPA Watershed Plan Elements: <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-WATER/2003/October/Day-23/w26755.htm>

State Water Board Statewide Data Management Programs

Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/
Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/>
SWAMP QAPP Template: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/swamp/docs/swampqapp_template032404.doc

US Census 2000 <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>

USEPA's NPS Program <http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA-WATER/2003/October/Day-23/w26755.htm>

APPENDIX C

Not Applicable

APPENDIX D
REQUESTS FOR WAIVER OR REDUCTION OF FUNDING MATCH FOR
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES
(APPLICABLE TO FULL PROPOSALS)

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this appendix is to provide a method for requesting a waiver or reduction of the funding match for the 319(h) NPS Grant Program. The State Water Board will review the information submitted by the applicant and decide, based on the information provided, whether to grant, amend, or deny, the request for the waiver or reduction. Applicants must demonstrate that the required funding match will be provided or request a waiver or reduction of the funding match and submit a signed certificate of understanding ([Exhibit D-1](#)).

At a minimum, the following information must be included in the application:

- ❖ Provide a map with sufficient geographic detail to define the boundaries of the disadvantaged community.
- ❖ Describe the methodology used in determining the total population of the project area and the total population of the disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area. The applicant must include what census geographies (i.e., census designated place, census tract, census block) were used, and how they were applied. Also, the applicant must explain how the disadvantaged communities were identified.
- ❖ Provide annual median household income (MHI) data for disadvantaged communities in the project area.
- ❖ Provide sample calculations showing how the proposed reduced funding match was derived.
- ❖ Provide information on amount and type of direct benefit(s) the project(s) provides to the disadvantaged community(ies).
- ❖ Include descriptions or information on the disadvantaged community's(ies') involvement, such as past, current, and future efforts to include disadvantaged community representatives in the planning and/or implementation process.
- ❖ Letters of support from representatives of disadvantaged communities indicating their support for the project or portion of the proposal designed to provide direct benefits to the disadvantaged communities and acknowledging their inclusion in the planning and/or implementation process.

The following data requirements must be met:

- ❖ MHI and population data sets must be from the 2000 Census or more recent; and
- ❖ MHI data used in analysis must be from the same time period and geography as the population data.

II. ALLOWANCES

- ❖ Applicants may estimate total and disadvantaged community population numbers by whatever means that are accessible to them as long as the above requirements are met.
- ❖ In determining MHI and population for a disadvantaged community(ies) and the project area, applicants may use a single type of census geography or combinations of 2000 Census geographies that best represent the project area. However, the census geography used must be consistent for both MHI and population for a particular community. Official census geographies, such as census tract, place, and block group, are acceptable. The intent of including this flexibility is to allow applicants a choice so that population and income data in the project area can be accurately represented.

III. DEFINITIONS

Block Group – means a census geography used by the United States Census Bureau (USCB) that is a subdivision of a census tract. A block group is the smallest geographic unit for which the USCB tabulates sample data. A block group consists of all the blocks within a census tract with the same beginning (block) number.

Census Designated Place – means a census geography used by the USCB that is a statistical entity, defined for each decennial census according to USCB guidelines, comprising a densely settled concentration of population that is not within an incorporated place, but is locally identified by a name. Census designated places are delineated cooperatively by State and local officials and the USCB, following USCB guidelines.

Census Tract – means a census geography used by the USCB that is a small, relatively permanent statistical subdivision of a county delineated by a local committee of census data users for the purpose of presenting data. Census tract boundaries normally follow visible features, but may follow governmental unit boundaries and other non-visible features in some instances; they always nest within counties. Census tracts are designed to be relatively homogeneous units with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions at the time of establishment. Census tracts average about 4,000 inhabitants.

Community – for the purposes of this grant program, a community is a population of persons residing in the same locality under the same local governance.

Disadvantaged Community – a community with an annual MHI that is less than 80% of the statewide MHI (CWC § 79505.5 (a)). For example, using Census 2000 data, 80% of the statewide annual MHI is \$37,994.

Place – a census geography used by the USCB that is a concentration of population either legally bounded as an incorporated place, or identified as a Census Designated Place.

IV. STEPS TO REQUEST A REDUCTION OR WAIVER OF THE FUNDING MATCH

Step A. Screening based on Maximum Grant Amount:

Grants awarded under the 319(h) NPS Grant Program have specific maximum grant amounts (presented in Section I.A) regardless of disadvantaged community status.

Step B. Documentation of the Presence of Disadvantaged Communities:

Disadvantaged communities must be located in the project area. **If there are no disadvantaged communities in the project area, please do not apply for a reduced funding match or waiver.** The disadvantaged community(ies) should be identified in the description of the project area in the FP. Applicants should ensure the description of the disadvantaged community(ies) is adequate to determine whether the community(ies) meet the definitions of this Appendix. The disadvantaged community(ies) should also be shown on maps of the project area. In describing the disadvantaged community(ies), include the relationship to the project objectives. Include information that supports the determination of disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area.

Step C. Documentation of Disadvantaged Community Representation & Participation:

The mere presence of a disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area is not sufficient cause to grant a waiver or reduction of the funding match. The disadvantaged community(ies) must be involved in the implementation process. Supporting information that demonstrates how the disadvantaged community(ies) is, or will be, involved in the implementation process of the project must be included. Information must demonstrate how the disadvantaged community(ies) or their representative(s) is participating in the implementation process. As indicated above, include letters of support from the disadvantaged community(ies) representatives that verify support, inclusion, and participation in the process. **If an applicant cannot demonstrate disadvantaged community representation or participation in the implementation process, please do not apply for a reduced funding match or waiver.**

Step D. Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Communities:

Applicants should explain anticipated benefits and impacts to the disadvantaged community(ies) in their project area for the specific work item(s) in their proposal. The explanation should include the nature of the anticipated benefit(s), the certainty that benefit(s) will accrue if the project is implemented, and which disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area will benefit.

Step E. Calculating a Reduced Funding Match:

The required funding match for the 319 (h) NPS Grant Program is presented in [Section I.A](#) of this Document. Where the project directly benefits a disadvantaged community, a reduction in the required funding match may be allowed. To reduce the required funding match, the applicant must determine the Disadvantaged Community Ratio (DCR), Benefit Factor (BF), and the Reduced Funding Match Factor (RFMF). The details of determining the DCR, BF, and RFMF, and an example calculation is provided below.

V. DETERMINING THE DCR FOR THE PROJECT AREA

Applicants can use any method that is reproducible and logical in determining populations in the project area as long as the requirements of this Appendix are met and the method is consistently applied. For assistance with accessing census data see the Census website ([Appendix B](#)). To calculate the DCR:

- ❖ Determine the total population of the project area. The total population in the project area = P_R
- ❖ Determine the total population of the disadvantaged community(ies) (e.g. MHI greater than zero but less than \$37,994) in the project area. The disadvantaged community population = P_D
- ❖ $DCR = P_D/P_R$

In determining populations and MHI for disadvantaged communities, applicants must ensure that population and MHI values of zero are appropriate for use in data sets. Text, data, and other information that supports selection of areas as a disadvantaged community(ies) must be provided. For assistance with accessing census data, see the 2000 Census data web link ([Appendix B](#)). Include the method used for population determination, the population of the project area, the population of disadvantaged communities in the project area, MHI data for disadvantaged communities, and the calculation of the reduced funding match.

VI. DETERMINING THE BF FOR THE PROJECT AREA

The BF is a function of the percentage of the disadvantaged community(ies) within the project area receiving direct benefit from the proposal. As described above, applicants must discuss and document direct benefits to disadvantaged communities from specific proposal elements. Select the BF that applies to your project area from the following table for use in the RFMF calculation:

Percentage of Disadvantaged Community(ies) in the Project Area Directly Benefited by the Proposal	Benefit Factor
More than 50%	1
25% - 50%	0.5
More than 0% but less than 25%	0.25

VII. DETERMINING THE RFMF FOR THE PROJECT AREA

The RFMF is a function of the DCR and BF and is calculated as follows:

❖ $RFMF = FM - (FM \times DCR \times BF)$

❖ Where:

FM = the minimum funding match for specific grant program;

DCR = P_D/P_R ; and

BF = 1, 0.5, or 0.25 as presented in the table above (Section VI of [Appendix D](#)).

❖ Round the RFMF to the nearest 0.01

The RFMF is then multiplied by the total proposal cost to determine the reduced funding match. The reduced funding match should be used in the budgets presented for the FP. An example calculation is shown below.

Example: Agency A is requesting a reduced funding match for a grant proposal from the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program that has a total cost of \$5,000,000.

$$P_R = 1,000,000$$

$$P_D = 750,000$$

$$DCR = 750,000/1,000,000 = 0.75$$

$$BF = 0.5^1$$

$$FM = 0.25$$

$$RFMF = 0.25 - (0.25 \times 0.75 \times 0.5)$$

$$= 0.25 - (0.09375)$$

$$= 0.15625 \text{ rounded to } 0.16 \text{ (or 16\%)}$$

Total Project Cost	Grant and Fund Match Using the Minimum Funding Match Requirement (25% of total)		Grant and Funding Match Using a Reduced Funding Match (16% of total)	
	Funding Match	Grant Funds	Funding Match	Grant Funds
\$5 Million	$0.25 \times \$5 \text{ M} = \1.25 M	$\$5 \text{ M} - \$1.25 \text{ M} = \$3.75 \text{ M}$	$0.16 \times \$5 \text{ M} = \0.8 M	$\$5 \text{ M} - \$0.8 \text{ M} = \$4.2 \text{ M}$

¹ Assuming 25-50% of the disadvantaged community(ies) in the project area directly benefit from the proposal.

EXHIBIT D-1: CERTIFICATION OF UNDERSTANDING

The undersigned certifies that:

The application submitted by <Insert Name of Applicant> for <Insert Proposal Title> for a <Insert Funding Source> grant contains a request for waiver or reduction of funding match based on disadvantaged communities.

The above named applicant understands:

- The waiver or reduction of the funding match presented in the application is a request that will not be automatically granted.
- The State Water Resources Control Board will review the disadvantaged community information submitted in the application prior to making a decision to accept, modify, or deny such a waiver or reduction.
- Should the proposal be chosen for funding, but the requested waiver or reduction in funding match be rejected or modified, the grantee is responsible for costs exceeding the grant funding amount to complete the project.
- The granting agency will rescind the grant award if the grantee cannot cover increased costs due to rejection or modification of the request for a waiver of or reduction in the funding match or adequately restructure the grant proposal so that it can meet the intent of the original proposal.

Authorized Signatory's Signature:

Printed Named:

Title:

Agency:

Date:

APPENDIX E

DEFINITIONS

Applicant – means an entity that files an application for funding under the provisions of Propositions 40 or 50, or Clean Water Act, Section 319 with the State Water Resources Control Board.

Application – refers to the electronic submission to the State Water Resources Control Board that requests grant funding for the project that the applicant intends to implement. It includes the responses to the questions included in the on-line application system as well as the proposal.

Areas of Special Biological Significance – means areas designated by the State Water Resources Control Board as requiring protection of species or biological communities to the extent that alteration of natural water quality is undesirable. All areas of special biological significance are State Water Quality Protection Areas as defined in Public Resources Code § 36700(f). There are 34 designated areas of special biological significance, which are listed in the California Ocean Plan.

Bay-Delta – means the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary as defined in section 79006 of the California Water Code.

Beneficial Uses - refers to the uses that streams, lakes, rivers, and other water bodies, have to humans and other life. These uses, or beneficial uses, are outlined in a Water Quality Control Plan, also called a Basin Plan. Categories of beneficial uses include water contact recreation, non-water contact recreation, municipal water supply, cold fresh water habitat, and more. Each body of water in the State has a set of beneficial uses it supports that may or may not include all categories of beneficial uses. Different beneficial uses require different water quality control. Therefore, each beneficial use has a set of water quality objectives designed to protect that beneficial use. Below is a list of some of the beneficial uses.

Water used for the following purposes: domestic (homes, human consumption, etc.), irrigation (crops, lawns), power (hydroelectric), municipal (water supply of a city or town), mining (hydraulic conveyance, drilling), industrial (commerce, trade, industry), fish and wildlife preservation, aquaculture (raising fish etc. for commercial purposes), recreational (boating, swimming), stockwatering (for commercial livestock), water quality, frost protection (misting or spraying crops to prevent frost damage), heat control (water crops to prevent heat damage), ground water recharge, agriculture, etc.

CALFED – refers to the consortium of State and Federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the Bay-Delta that are developing a long-term solution to water management, environmental, and other problems in the Bay-Delta watershed, as defined in Section 79008 of the California Water Code.

Capital Cost - as defined in Public Resources Code, Section 32025, “cost” as applied to a project, or a part thereof, financed under this division, or any part of, the costs of construction and acquisition, of all lands, structures, real or personal property, rights, rights-of-way, franchises, easements, and interests acquired or used for a project, the cost of demolition or removal of any buildings or structures on land so acquired, including the cost of acquiring any lands on which buildings or structures may be removed, the cost of all machinery and equipment, financing charges, interest prior to, during, and for a period after completion of the construction,

as determined by the authority, provisions for working capital, reserves for principal and interest, and for extensions, enlargements, additions, replacements, renovations, and improvements, the cost of architectural, engineering, financial, and legal services, plans, specifications, estimates, administrative expenses, and other expenses necessary or incident to determining the feasibility of constructing any project, or incident to the construction or acquisition or financing of any project.

Critical Coastal Areas (CCA) Program – means an innovative program, required by California's Nonpoint Source Pollution Plan to foster collaboration among local stakeholders and government agencies, to better coordinate resources and focus efforts on coastal-zone watershed areas in critical need of protection from polluted runoff.

Disadvantaged Community – means a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income (California Water Code § 79505.5 (a)).

Environmental Justice – means the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or social-economic groups should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations, or the execution of Federal, State, local, and tribal programs and policies.

Evaluation Criteria – means the set of requirements used to choose a project for a given program or for funding; the specifications or criteria used for selecting or choosing a project based on available funding.

Funding Match – means funds made available by the grantee from non-State sources. The funding match may include, but is not limited to, federal funds, local funding, or donated and volunteer services from non-State sources. A State agency may use State funds and services. (California Water Code § 79505.5 [b-c]) Eligible reimbursable expenses incurred after adoption of the Guidelines and prior to the project completion date can be applied to the funding match. Additionally, education and outreach may qualify as a portion of the funding match.

Grantee – refers to a grant recipient such as public agencies, local public agencies, public colleges, tribes, or nonprofit organizations as defined in this Appendix, which are eligible for grant funding.

Granting Agency – means the agency that is funding a proposal and with which a grantee has a grant agreement. The State Water Resources Control Board will be the granting agency for the 2008 NPS Implementation Grant Program.

Impaired Water Body – means surface waters identified by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards as impaired because water quality objectives are not being achieved or where the designated beneficial uses are not fully protected after application of technology-based controls. A list of impaired water bodies is compiled by the State Water Resources Control Board pursuant to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

Indian Tribes – refers to federally recognized tribes.

Integrated Plan for Implementation of Watershed Management Initiative – refers to the combined Watershed Management Initiative Chapters of all nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards, as well as the State Water Resources Control Board and United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Local Public Agency – is any city, county, city and county, or district.

Local Watershed Management Plan – as defined in Section 79078 of the California Water Code, refers to a document prepared by a local watershed group that sets forth a strategy to achieve an ecologically stable watershed, and that does all of the following: (1) defines the geographical boundaries of the watershed; (2) describes the natural resource conditions within the watershed; (3) describes measurable characteristics for water quality improvements; (4) describes methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements; (5) identifies any person, organization, or public agency that is responsible for implementing the methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements; (6) provides milestones for implementing the methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements; and (7) describes a monitoring program designed to measure the effectiveness of the methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements.

Management Measures – means economically achievable measures for the control of the addition of pollutants from existing and new categories and classes of nonpoint sources of pollution, which reflect the greatest degrees of pollutant reduction achievable through the application of the best available nonpoint pollution control practices, technologies, processes, siting criteria, operating methods, or alternatives.

Nonpoint Source Pollution (NPS) - NPS Pollution is water pollution that does not originate from a discrete point, such as a sewage treatment plant outlet. NPS pollution is a by-product of land use practices, such as those associated with farming, timber harvesting, construction management, marina and boating activities, road construction and maintenance, mining, and urbanized areas not regulated under the point source stormwater program. Primary pollutants include sediment, fertilizers, pesticides and other pollutants that are picked up by water traveling over and through the land and are delivered to surface and ground water via precipitation, runoff, and leaching. From a regulatory perspective, pollutant discharges that are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) are considered to be point sources. By definition, all other discharges are considered nonpoint sources of pollution.

Nonpoint Source Pollution Plan (NPS Plan) – refers to the State Water Resources Control Board adopted plan developed in collaboration with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards and the California Coastal Commission to meet the requirements of section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 and Section 319 of the Clean Water Act. The Plan addresses California's nonpoint source pollution by assessing the State's nonpoint source pollution problems/causes and implementing management programs.

Nonprofit Organization – means any California corporation organized under Sections 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), or 501(c)(5) of the Federal Internal Revenue Code.

Section 501(c)(3) defines Nonprofit Organizations as:

“Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or international amateur sports competition (but only if no part of

its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection (h)), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.”

Section 501(c)(4) defines Nonprofit Organizations as:

“Civic leagues or organizations not organized for profit but operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare, or local associations of employees, the membership of which is limited to the employees of a designated person or persons in a particular municipality, and the net earnings of which are devoted exclusively to charitable, educational, or recreational purposes.

Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an entity unless no part of the net earnings of such entity inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.”

Section 501(c)(5) defines Nonprofit Organizations as:

“Labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations.”

Northern California – means those counties not listed below as “Southern California.”

Ocean Protection Council Priorities – means priorities identified by the Ocean Protection Council.

Partner Agency Priorities – means priorities identified by Partner Agencies, as presented in the Guidelines. Partner Agencies include the Resources Agency, Department of Water Resources, Department of Boating and Waterways, Department of Food and Agriculture, Department of Fish and Game, Department of Health Services, Department of Parks and Recreation, California Coastal Commission, State Coastal Conservancy, Department of Forestry, Department of Conservation, and CALFED.

Pollutant Load Reduction – means the decrease of a particular contaminant in the impaired waterbody resulting from the implementation of the project.

Project – refers to the entire set of actions, including planning, permitting, constructing, monitoring, and reporting on all of the proposed activities, including structural and non-structural implementation of management measures and practices.

Project Area - refers to the geographical boundaries, as defined by the applicant, which encompass the area where the project will be implemented/constructed, including the area where the benefits and impacts of project implementation or planning activities extend. For projects to develop local watershed management plans, the project area includes the entire area included in the planning activities.

Proposal – refers to all of the supporting documentation submitted that details the project and actions that are proposed for funding pursuant to an application for a grant.

Proposition 40 – is the “California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002,” as set forth in Division 5 of the Public Resources Code (commencing at § 5096.600).

Proposition 50 – is the “Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Act of 2002”, as set forth in Division 26.5 of the California Water Code (commencing at § 79500).

Public Agency – is any city, county, city and county, district, the State, or any agency or department thereof.

Public Colleges – refers to State Universities, Universities of California, and community colleges.

Public Works – as defined in the California Labor Code, Section 1720.

Regional Agency – means public agencies with statutory authority over land-use or water management whose jurisdiction encompasses an area greater than the jurisdictional boundaries of any one local public agency.

REGIONAL WATER BOARDS PRIORITIES – MEANS PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY THE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARDS, AS PRESENTED IN THE GUIDELINES.

Reimbursable Costs – means costs that may be funded under Propositions 40 and 50.

Reimbursable costs include the reasonable costs of engineering, design, land and easement, legal fees, preparation of environmental documentation, environmental mitigation, and project implementation. Education and outreach is not fundable unless it is a component of a project funded through the federally funded 319 (h) NPS Grant Program (Clean Water Act, Section 319(h)) or a cost that is a component of a demonstration project funded through the Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program.

Costs that are not reimbursable with grant funding include, but are not limited to:

- a. Costs, other than those noted above, incurred outside the terms of the grant agreement with the State;
- b. Operation and maintenance costs, including post construction project performance and monitoring costs;
- c. Purchase of equipment not an integral part of the project;
- a. Establishing a reserve fund;
- e. Replacement of existing funding sources for ongoing programs;
- f. Expenses incurred in preparation of the Concept Proposal and FP;
- g. Purchase of land (except in the case of the Integrated Watershed Management Program, where the minimum required acreage necessary to operate as an integral part of the project, as set forth and detailed by engineering and feasibility studies, is reimbursable); and
- i. Payment of principal or interest of existing indebtedness or any interest payments unless the debt is incurred within the terms of the grant agreement with the State, the granting agency agrees in writing to the eligibility of the costs for reimbursement before the debt is incurred, and the purposes for which the debt is incurred are otherwise reimbursable project costs.

Selection Panel – means a group of technical reviewers assembled to review and consider proposal evaluations and scores and to make initial funding recommendations.

Southern California – means the Counties of San Diego, Riverside, Orange, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Ventura.

Stakeholder – is an individual, group, coalition, agency, or others who are involved in, affected by, or have an interest in the implementation of a specific program or project.

State Water Board Priorities – means priorities identified by the State Water Resources Control Board, as presented in the Guidelines.

Technical Reviewers – means a group of agency representatives assembled to evaluate the technical competence of a proposed project and the feasibility of the project being successful if implemented.

303(d) List – refers to section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act that requires each state to periodically submit to the United States Environmental Protection Agency a list of impaired waters. Impaired waters are those that are not meeting the State's water quality standards. Once the impaired waters are identified and placed on the list, section 303(d) requires that the State establish total maximum daily loads that will meet water quality standards for each listed water body.

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) – identifies the maximum quantity of a particular pollutant that can be discharged into a water body without violating a water quality standard, and allocates allowable loading amounts among the identified pollutant sources.

Urban Water Supplier – means a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplies more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually. (California Water Code §10617)

Watershed Management Area (WMA) – is a basic planning unit and may contain one or more drainage "basins" or "watersheds." For more detailed information on WMAs refer to the Watershed Management Initiative Chapter(s) for the region(s) in which the project is located.

APPENDIX F

REQUIRED ELEMENTS FOR WATERSHED-BASED PLANS PER CWA SECTION 319

All projects supported with Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 319 funds must implement activities based on watershed-based plans (as per the United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA] nine key elements) and total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) (existing or under development). This appendix describes the requirements for watershed-based plans. The nine key elements of watershed-based plans, which are explained in more detail below, are:

1. CAUSES AND SOURCES;
2. EXPECTED LOAD REDUCTIONS;
3. MANAGEMENT MEASURES;
4. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE;
5. INFORMATION/EDUCATION;
6. SCHEDULE;
7. MEASURABLE MILESTONES;
8. EVALUATION OF PROGRESS; AND
9. MONITORING.

Watershed-based plans are holistic documents that are designed to protect and restore a watershed. These plans provide a careful analysis of the sources of water quality problems, their relative contributions to the problems, and alternatives to solve those problems. Watershed-based plans should also deliver proactive measures to protect waterbodies. In watersheds where a TMDL has been developed and approved or is in process of being developed, watershed-based plans must be designed to achieve the load reductions called for in the TMDL.

For additional information, including the full text of the Section 319 guidelines, visit the USEPA's nonpoint source website ([Appendix B](#)).

I. WATERSHED-BASED PLANS IN CALIFORNIA

In California, wide ranges of plans are being used to comply with the nine key elements, often in combination with each other. Examples of plans that are being used to comply with the key elements include local watershed plans, coordinated resource management plans, TMDL implementation plans, comprehensive conservation and management plans, Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans), and their Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards) Watershed Management Initiative (WMI) Chapters under the WMI Integrated Plan, and combinations thereof. Applicants that need assistance may work with their Regional Water Boards to verify that the combination of plans has the nine elements. Those elements that are not included in existing plans will need to be incorporated into the plans, as appropriate, to be eligible for Section 319 funds. During the FP stage of the grant selection process, applicants for Section 319 funds will complete a table (Table F-1) to indicate where each key element is addressed. Grant awards may be withdrawn if the nine elements cannot be verified.

II. NINE KEY ELEMENTS

Element 1: Causes and Sources

Clearly define the causes and sources of impairment (physical, chemical, and biological).

Element 2: Expected Load Reductions

An estimate of the load reductions expected for each of the management measures or best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented (recognizing the natural variability and the difficulty in precisely predicting the performance of management measures over time).

Element 3: Management Measures

A description of the management measures or management practices and associated costs that will need to be implemented to achieve the load reductions estimated in this plan and an identification (using a map or a description) of the critical areas where those measures are needed.

Element 4: Technical and Financial Assistance

An estimate of the amounts of technical and financial assistance needed, associated costs, and/or the sources and authorities that will be relied upon, to implement this plan.

Element 5: Information/Education

An information/education component that will be used to enhance public understanding of the project and encourage their early and continued participation in selecting, designing, and implementing management measures.

Element 6: Schedule

A schedule for implementing management measures identified in this plan that is reasonably expeditious.

Element 7: Measurable Milestones

A schedule of interim, measurable milestones for determining whether the management measures, BMPs, or other control actions are being implemented.

Element 8: Evaluation of Progress

A set of criteria that can be used to determine whether loading reductions are being achieved over time and substantial progress is being made towards attaining water quality standards and, if not, the criteria for determining whether the plan needs to be revised or, if a TMDL has been established, whether the TMDL needs to be revised.

Element 9: Monitoring

A monitoring component to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation efforts over time, measured against the criteria established in the Evaluation of Progress element.

APPENDIX G
STATEWIDE, REGIONAL AND PARTNER AGENCY
PRIORITIES

- [Appendix G](#), the Statewide, Regional, & Partner Agency Priorities, is available (as a separate file), under a separate cover.

Appendix G is available on-line at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/funding/docs/consolidgrants0506/cg_final_priorities_appendix_g.pdf

APPENDIX H

CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

[APPENDIX H-1 CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION](#)

[APPENDIX H-2 CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA](#)

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in [Appendix H](#) may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The technical content and requirements will not change.

APPENDIX H-1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

The fields contained on this page are included in the Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) for every Request for Proposal (RFP)/Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) that is released online by the State Water Board's Division of Financial Assistance. Because the fields are shared by all programs, they are not customized for A specific grant program. The grant specific information is in the Concept Proposal Project Information Application.

QUESTIONS AUTOMATICALLY INCLUDED ONLINE IN FAAST

General Details

- RFP Title, Project Title, Project Description (1,000 character limit), Applicant Name, Project Director

Project Budget

- Grant Funds Requested, Funding Match, Total Project Cost

Project Location

- Latitude & Longitude, Primary County, Primary Watershed, Primary Water Body, Primary Responsible Regional Water Board

Funding Source

- Applicant selects one or more checkboxes representing program(s) for the particular RFP/PSP

Legislative

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|------------|
| ○ District | Primary | Additional |
| Assembly District | | |
| Senate District | | |
| US Congressional District | | |

Contact Agency

- Agency Name, Contact Name, Phone, Email

Cooperating Entity

- Role on Project, Contact Name, Phone, Email

APPENDIX H-1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

CONCEPT PROPOSAL PROJECT INFORMATION APPLICATION (TO BE COMPLETED ON-LINE IN FFAST.)

This section contains the questions for the 319(h) NPS Grant Program which appears in the online application. If additional space is needed, submit a 4-page attachment to complete your response to one or more questions. Applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with Regional Water Board or USEPA staff before completing this application.

Contacts are available in Attachment 2 of this Solicitation Notice.

I. ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONS

1. Is the proposed project being undertaken pursuant to a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, including a municipal stormwater permit? ***Projects which include activities required under a NPDES permit are not eligible for 319(h) funding.*** Please describe your answer in the box below. If you are unsure of your eligibility, please contact the Regional Board or U.S. EPA contact listed in Attachment 2.
2. Select the applicant's organization type (e.g. public agency, nonprofit, public college, tribe, etc.) from the drop-down menu below.
3. Indicate if your project implements an adopted TMDL or supports a TMDL under development. Then, briefly describe (1) The TMDL, (2) the anticipated pollutant load reductions that will be achieved in relation to the load reductions called for in the TMDL; and (3) how your project is consistent with the identified TMDL. If a TMDL is not yet adopted, please indicate the current stage of the TMDL under development and the expected timeline for completion. Please note that the presence of a waterbody on the 303(d) list of impaired waters is not an indication of the TMDL status. Applicants are encouraged to coordinate with their appropriate Regional Water Board to identify the TMDL status.
4. Describe the problem(s) the project is proposing to solve and the source(s) of the problem(s), if known and describe how the project meets the eligible project types outlined for the 319(h) Program:
 - Must implement activities that contribute to reduced pollutant loads as called for in an existing TMDL or a TMDL that is currently under development.
 - Must implement activities that are part of watershed plans that address the USEPA nine required watershed-based plan elements. Guidance on the Required Elements for Watershed-Based Plans, per CWA Section 319, is provided in [Appendix F](#).
 - Must ensure the continued proper operation and maintenance of all management practices that have been implemented in accordance with National Resource Conservation Service's Field Office Technical Guides (see [Appendix B](#)) or other appropriate standards.

II. PROJECT QUESTIONS

APPENDIX H-1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

5. Describe the approach the project is proposing to use to solve the problem(s) and the technical basis for the selected approach. Describe how the project is expected to benefit water quality and beneficial uses and how do you propose to measure and document your project's benefits to water quality and beneficial uses (e.g., before and after concentrations of a constituent, miles of river restored, percent load reduction, number of people educated, data that conforms to the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program template and Quality Assurance Project Plan, increase amount of water banked or recharged, acres of open space protected or restored, amount of stormwater captured, etc.). Make sure to identify any risks to water quality associated with the proposed approach.
6. In a separate attachment (Attachment A), provide up to 4 pages to address the following questions. Address each of the questions below as the different sections in your document as you answer each of them.
 1. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**- Provide a detailed description including a discussion on how your project meets the 319(h) program preferences as described in Part II of this solicitation.
 2. **PLANNING AND DESIGN**- Describe the work that has been completed for the planning and design of the project
 3. **WORK ITEMS AND SCHEDULE**- Include a list of all major project work items and the associated schedule for completion of all major project work items.
 4. **PROJECT TEAM**- Provide a list of your project team members and their expertise.
7. Has a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document been prepared for this project? What type of CEQA document was or will be prepared for this project? (Select from drop down menu below.) What is the status of the CEQA document, if applicable?
8. Will the project require local, state or federal permits? What is the status of the permit application(s), if applicable?
9. Does the Project provide a direct benefit to the disadvantaged community(ies)? If yes, please indicate if you will be requesting a waiver or reduction of the funding match for the project.
10. Have project implementation sites been selected? If yes provide a list of the potential sites, and potential land owners' contact information. Otherwise, describe site selection process in detail and the geographic scale of the project.
11. Describe the anticipated source (Prop 50, Prop 40, Federal, etc) and amount of proposed funding match for the project. Please indicate if the funding match is secured or pending.

III. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

12. For a project that extends beyond more than one Regional Water Board boundary, please list the Regional Water Boards your project spans.
13. In the Questions Automatically Included On-Line in FAAST section, you entered the primary watershed for your project. If your project encompasses multiple watersheds, list the name of each watershed. For a project that encompasses multiple water bodies in those listed watersheds, list the name and portion/segment of each water body covered by the project. Use the Watershed Management Areas (WMAs) identified in the applicable Regional Water Board's

APPENDIX H-1: CONCEPT PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Watershed Management Initiative (WMI) chapter. Please see [Appendix B](#) of the Guidelines for website addresses for the WMI chapters.

14. For your primary watershed and each of the watersheds listed in response to Question 13, indicate if the watershed has an established watershed group. If an established watershed group(s) exists, provide the name of the group(s). Identify who you have contacted in the watershed and how are you targeting work in the sub-watersheds. Describe how the proposed project furthers a comprehensive watershed approach. Is the proposed project consistent with a completed watershed assessment or an adopted plan? If so, identify the name of the watershed assessment or plan and describe with specific examples, how your project implements the plan, and whether your project has been identified as a priority in the plan. If not, please indicate when the plan is scheduled for adoption. If no adoption is scheduled, explain why.
15. Describe how your project is coordinated with other efforts in the watershed.
16. Have you applied for and/or previously received partial or full funding from other grant programs from the State Water Board or other agencies for this project or any other similar projects that you have completed successfully? If yes, identify the agency and program, and indicate project titles, contract or grant agreement numbers, and status of funding (e.g., contract or grant agreement in negotiation, ongoing, closed out, terminated, etc.) and a brief description of each project. (Only include projects funded since January 2000.)
17. Has the Applicant or any Cooperating Entities entered into a contract or grant agreement: (1) that was terminated; (2) in which funds were withheld by the State Water Board; or (3) that has been the subject of an audit in which there were findings regarding the management of the project or funds by the Applicant or a Cooperating Entity? If so, please explain in the box below, including actions taken to address the problem(s).
18. Is the Applicant or was the Applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the project? If so, please explain in the box below (include the name and case number in your explanation).
19. ☐ _____ (Initials) Disclaimer: The Project Director has read and understands the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement. If the Project Director does not agree with the terms and conditions, a grant award may be denied. (All applicants will be required to check the box and initial next to the statement.)

APPENDIX H – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

2008 319 (h) NPS Grant Program: ELIGIBILITY REVIEW		
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	YES / NO	KEY
General Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST) Information 1. Does the Concept Proposal contain all the required information requested in the FAAST? (e.g., General Details, Project Budget, Project Location, Funding Source, Legislative Information, Contact Agency Information, Cooperating Entity Information, etc.)		Applicant must receive "Yes" for ALL questions to be eligible for invite back. YES = APPLICANT ELIGIBLE TO BE INVITED BACK TO SUBMIT FULL PROPOSAL NO = APPLICANT IS NOT ELIGIBLE TO BE INVITED BACK TO SUBMIT FULL PROPOSAL
Eligibility 2. Is the applicant eligible for the funding source? (Question 4)		
3. Is the project an eligible project type for the funding source? (Questions 1 to 3)		
4. Is the applicant eligible for the funding source based on the priorities the project will address? (Questions 1 to 3)		
Readiness to Proceed 5. Does the project's estimated "Start Date" and "End Date" fall within the appropriations for the funding source? (Question 26)		
Applicant Information 6. Has the applicant checked the box and initialed that the Project Director has read and understands the General Terms and Conditions of the Grant Agreement? (Question 33)		
Overall Evaluation 7. Indicate if the Concept Proposal should be scored, based on answers to Questions 1 through 6 above?		YES = CONCEPT PROPOSAL SHOULD BE SCORED. NO = CONCEPT PROPOSAL SHOULD NOT BE SCORED.
8. If the Concept Proposal is eligible, please list the agencies that should review and score the Concept Proposal.		REGION 1, REGION 2, REGION 3, REGION 4, REGION 5, REGION 6, REGION 7, REGION 8, REGION 9, USEPA, STATE WATER BOARD,

APPENDIX H – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

2008 NPS Implementation Grant PROGRAM CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION: SCORING CRITERIA		
SCORED CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS POSSIBLE¹
1. How well does the project address priorities of the 319(h) NPS Grant Program? (Question Attachment A)		0 - 4
2. Does the project address multiple 319 h priorities? (Attachment A)		3 points if it meets one 4 points if it meets two 5 points if it meets all three
3. Is the description of the major project work items reasonable? (Attachment A)		0 – 4
4. Is the project timeline realistic? (Attachment A)		0 – 4
5. How well does the applicant define the problem(s) the project is proposing to solve? (Question 4)		0 – 4
6. Does the approach appear to be technically feasible? (Question 5)		0 – 4
7. Is the approach likely to yield the expected benefits and how do the expected benefits compare to the risks? (Questions 5)		0 – 4
8. Does the project implement an adopted total maximum daily load (TMDL), which is specifically mentioned in an implementation plan? (Question 3)		2 Points if the project implements an adopted TMDL
9. Does the project implement a TMDL under development? Is the timeline specified and how well does the timeline fit the applicable grant program timeframe? (Question 3)		1 Point if the project implements a TMDL under development
10. How well are the project's anticipated pollutant load reductions defined in the Concept Proposal? (Question 3)		0 - 4
11. How well will the proposed approach allow the applicant to quantify and document the project's benefits to water quality and beneficial uses? (Question 5)		0 – 4
12. How well is the proposed project integrated/identified in the watershed planning efforts? (Questions 14 and 15)		0 – 4
13. How well prepared is the applicant for the permits and regulatory requirements that may be necessary for the project? (Questions 7 and 8)		0 - 4
14. How well does the applicant address their readiness to proceed? (Attachment A, 10 and 11.		0 - 4

APPENDIX H – 2: CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

2008 NPS Implementation Grant PROGRAM CONCEPT PROPOSAL EVALUATION: SCORING CRITERIA		
SCORED CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS POSSIBLE ¹
15. Does the applicant have a good track record? If not, are the proposed actions taken to address the problem(s) sufficient? (Questions 16-18)		0 pts if Negative 2 pts if Neutral 5 pts if Good
Overall Evaluation 16. What is the score of this Concept Proposal?		57
17. Should the applicant be invited back to submit a Full Proposal?		Yes = No =
18. Discuss any concerns with respect to the responses to Questions 29 – 32.		
19. If this applicant is invited to submit a Full Proposal, discuss suggestions on how to improve the proposal/project. (Note to Reviewers: This text will be provided to the applicant. Be clear and concise.)		

¹ Unless otherwise noted, each criterion will be scored on a scale of 0 to 4 with a 0 being “low” and a 4 being “high,” with points assigned to the Concept Proposal for each criterion as follows:

- A score of 4 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 3 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is marginally supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 2 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and is marginally supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 1 point will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and is not supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 0 point will be awarded where the applicant is not responsive (i.e., the criterion is not addressed and no rationale is presented).

² **ACRONYMS**

CCC = CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CDFA = CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

DFG = DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DHS = DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

DPR = DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

DWR = DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

RB = REGIONAL WATER BOARDS

SB = STATE WATER BOARD

SCC = STATE COASTAL CONSERVANCY

USEPA = UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

APPENDIX I

FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

[APPENDIX I-1 FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS](#)

[APPENDIX I-2 FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA](#)

Please note that the application and/or review questions outlined in [Appendix I](#) may be slightly reworded, combined, or separated as the information is transferred to the online Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The technical content and requirements will not change.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Applicants will be asked to organize their FP in a format that will be consistent with the evaluation criteria. This approach should assist applicants in providing complete documentation and will streamline the review process. Applicants should use consistent terminology throughout their FP application. FPs will be submitted online using the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST).

The following information will be requested as part of the FP submittal:

I. Eligibility: This information will be requested in a question and answer format in FAAST. This format will allow the reviewers to verify the continued eligibility of the FP for the applicable funding source. The eligibility section has been placed first so that applicants may confirm eligibility prior to application completion.

II. FP General Submittal Requirements: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST. This part of the application documents, among other things, scope of work, schedule, budget, stakeholder involvement, and disadvantaged community information. The information requested as part of this attachment will be applicable to all FPs, regardless of the funding source for which the application will be evaluated.

III. Integrated Watershed Management Program (IWMP) Planning Proposals Supplemental Submittal Requirements

Not applicable to 319(h) NPS Grant Program

IV. Implementation Proposals Supplemental Submittal Requirements: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST. This part of the application provides documentation of benefits and impacts, technical and scientific merit, monitoring and data collection, and project performance and assessment.

V. Program-Specific Supplemental Submittal Requirements: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST. The information will be program-specific and will document information not provided in other sections of the application that are an important part of the proposal evaluation.

VI. Additional Application Information/General Program Questions: This information will be requested in a question and answer format in FAAST. The information will be important for the Selection Panels to have available when making funding recommendations.

More details on the minimum information that must be provided in the FP for each of the sections are discussed in the corresponding sections below.

I. ELIGIBILITY

The eligibility information will be requested in a question and answer format in FAAST. Incomplete or ineligible applications will not be reviewed.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

i. General Eligibility

Provide information to demonstrate completeness, applicant and project eligibility, and consistency with the Concept Proposal (CP).

A. Application Eligibility Information

All proposals must meet the Eligibility Requirements outlined in [Section III](#) of this document. The following information will be requested:

- ☐ Submit application completeness checklist (provided in FP Solicitation).
- ☐ Identify the Applicant's entity type. Explain how the Applicant is eligible for the requested funding program and whether the Applicant has legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board. Describe any legal agreements amongst applicant's partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the Proposal and tracking of funds. If applicable, include a copy of the certification of incorporation for the organization. (Submit information requested in [Exhibit I-1](#), which is located at the end of the Eligibility Section.
- ☐ Specify the requested grant amount (the requested grant amount must be between the minimum and maximum eligible amount for the funding source).
- ☐ Describe how the minimum match requirement will be met, or if the Applicant is requesting a waiver or reduction based on the disadvantaged community status. (Submit information requested in [Appendix D](#).)
- ☐ Describe why the proposed Project is eligible for funding.

B. Proposal Consistency with Concept Proposal (CP) & Responsiveness

Provide information to document that the scope of work is consistent with the CP and describe any changes made or not made in response to the reviewer comments.

- ☐ Briefly describe how the FP is consistent with the CP.
- ☐ Briefly describe any modifications made since the submittal of the CP and how they have impacted the scope of work.
- ☐ Briefly outline the CP reviewer comments that you have incorporated, if applicable. If reviewer comments have not been incorporated, explain why.

ii. Program-Specific Eligibility

C. Eligibility for Accelerated Selection and Contracting Procedure (ASCP) Not Applicable

D. Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program Proposals (Proposition 50) Not Applicable

E. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Control Program Proposals (Proposition 40) Not Applicable

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

F. NPS Implementation Program Proposals [Clean Water Act, Section 319(h) Program]

Provide documentation demonstrating eligibility for the federally funded NPS Implementation Program.

- ☐ Briefly describe the activities the Project will implement to achieve pollutant load reductions consistent with an established Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) or a TMDLs under development.
- ☐ Briefly discuss how the proposed activities are consistent with watershed plans. Provide documentation that addresses the USEPA required elements for watershed-based plans, as required in [Appendix F](#).
- ☐ Briefly describe provisions for the proper operation and maintenance of the management practices that will be implemented in accordance with the National Resource Conservation Services Field Office Technical Guides or other appropriate standards.
- ☐ If applicable, briefly describe whether the Project will report the following key data, as applicable: sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream banks or acres of wetlands protected or restored.
- ☐ If applicable, briefly describe how the sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream bank, or acres of wetlands protected or restored will be documented.

G. Integrated Watershed Management Program Planning Proposals (Proposition 40) Not Applicable

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

EXHIBIT I-1

ELIGIBLE APPLICANT DOCUMENTATION

Local Public Agencies and Public Agencies

1. Is the applicant a local public agency or a public agency as defined in [Appendix E](#) of this document? Please explain.
2. What is the statutory or other legal authority under which the applicant was formed and is authorized to operate?
3. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board?
4. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

Nonprofit Organizations

1. Is the applicant a nonprofit organization as defined in [Appendix E](#) of this document? Specify the applicant's nonprofit organization type (e.g., 501[c][3], etc.). Please explain.
2. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board?
3. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.
4. Include a copy of the certificate of incorporation for the organization.

Public Colleges

1. Is the applicant a public college as defined in [Appendix E](#) of this document? Please explain.
2. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board?
3. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

Indian Tribes

1. Is the applicant a federally recognized Indian Tribe as described in [Appendix E](#) of this document? Please explain.
2. What is the statutory or other legal authority under which the applicant was formed and is authorized to operate?
3. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board?
4. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

State Agencies

1. Is the applicant a State Agency? Please explain.
2. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board?
3. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

Federal Agencies

1. Is the applicant a Federal Agency? Please explain.
2. Does the applicant have legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board?
3. Describe any legal agreements among partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the proposal and tracking of funds.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

II. FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Project Description & Objectives

- ☐ Provide a detailed description of the proposed Project for which funding is requested.
- ☐ Provide a detailed map of the Project area, including the area and/or watershed encompassed by the Project, the location of the Project, disadvantaged communities within the Project area (if applicable), and a narrative description of the Project.
- ☐ Identify the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed Project, and the manner in which they will be achieved.
- ☐ Provide a discussion of the important ecological processes and environmental resources within the watershed area affected by the Project.
- ☐ Describe the beneficial uses of the water body(ies) affected by the Project referenced in the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan).
- ☐ Identify whether and how the Project targets specific water quality pollutants or parameters that are critical to the overall condition of the water resources in the area.

B. Project Team & Administration

- ☐ Describe how the Applicant demonstrates the experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the Project. The Applicant may provide examples of past successes in completing previous grant funded projects.
- ☐ Describe the partnership agreements, corresponding roles, and institutional structure that will be used to ensure successful completion of the Project. This should include reference to the staff resources that will be used to finalize the grant agreement and successfully implement the Project.
- ☐ Identify project leaders within each cooperating entity to ensure consistent, long-term implementation of the Project.
- ☐ Provide resumes of key project team members and describe the percentage of time commitment by key staff.
- ☐ Provide other relevant supporting information that demonstrates the Applicant's ability to successfully complete the Project.

C. Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination

- ☐ Identify stakeholders and the process used to include the stakeholders in the development of the Proposal.
- ☐ Discuss how the stakeholders:
 - ☐ Were/will be identified;
 - ☐ Have/will participate in the planning and/or implementation efforts; and
 - ☐ Influence decisions made regarding Project implementation.
- ☐ Discuss the mechanisms and processes that have been and will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Project.
- ☐ Describe and document any public outreach activities directed towards specific stakeholder groups, as well as stakeholders not involved as Project participants, including disadvantaged communities and environmental justice communities.
- ☐ Include any letters of support from stakeholder groups.
- ☐ Discuss watershed and/or other partnerships developed during the Project planning process.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

- ❑ Describe how the Applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, State, and Federal agencies during implementation of the proposed Project.

D. Financing/Funding Match

Provide documentation indicating a feasible program of continued financing for implementation, operation, and maintenance of the Project and the Applicant's ability to meet or exceed the minimum-funding match. **Indicating the availability of matching funds that later become unavailable will be considered a deviation from the proposed Project and may result in the grant being withdrawn.**

- ❑ Provide the funding match percentage, which meets or exceeds the minimum amount specified for the Program in the Guidelines.
- ❑ If requesting a waiver or reduction of the funding match, provide the information requested in [Appendix D](#), including a completed [Exhibit D-1](#) and a discussion of how much direct benefit the Project provides to disadvantaged communities.
- ❑ Include a summary showing the financing mechanisms for all the related elements of the Project.
- ❑ Discuss the reliability of the proposed cost-sharing partner commitments, including whether the matching funds are dependent on actions by other entities.
- ❑ Describe the Applicant's ability to leverage other funds to complete the Project.
- ❑ If applicable, discuss the mechanisms for ongoing support and financing to continue operation and maintenance of the implemented Project.

E. Cost Estimate/Budget

- ❑ Discuss whether the costs are reasonable and relevant to the stated outcomes. Explain how costs were estimated.
- ❑ Provide a reasonable estimate of cost for each work item (i.e., line item) contained in the Proposal, including planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match. Provide a summary of all costs rolled up into the cost summary table (see [Exhibit I-2](#)).
- ❑ Discuss how all costs are directly related to Project implementation (i.e., no overhead).
- ❑ If applicable, provide cost estimates and funding sources for those tasks that are not proposed for funding but are related and important to the success of the proposed Project (i.e., non-grant and non-match funded activities).
- ❑ Provide a description of any prior investments the Applicant has made towards the Project (i.e., money previously spent on planning, design, or environmental compliance).

F. Schedule

- ❑ Provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing for implementation of the proposed Project.
- ❑ Discuss how the schedule is consistent with the work plan and identify any possible obstacles to the Project implementation.
- ❑ Discuss the related elements of the Project, their current status, and how the Applicant plans to ensure the timely completion of these related elements.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

EXHIBIT I-2:

EXAMPLE COST ESTIMATE TABLE

Provide a reasonable estimate of the cost for all work items (i.e., line item) including planning and design costs, construction costs. If the Proposal includes more than one Project, complete the following table for each Project in the proposal package for which funding is requested.

Cost Estimate Table Proposal Title and PIN Number:				
Budget Category		Non-State Share (Funding Match)	Requested State Share (Grant Funding)	Total
(a)	Direct Project Administration Costs			
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement			
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental			
(d)	Construction/Implementation			
(e)	Environmental			
(f)	Project Summary [Sum (a) through (e) for each			
(g)	Construction Administration			
(h)	Other (Explain):			
(i)	Construction/Implementation Contingency			
(j)	Grant Total [Sum (f) through (i) for each column]			
Source(s) of funds for Non-State Share (Funding Match)				

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Budget Category Explanations

Direct Project Administration Costs – Includes: salaries, wages, fringe benefits, office supplies, and equipment needed to support the project, staff travel costs (at or below the rate allowed for unrepresented State employees), and preparation of required progress and final reports. This budget category includes all such costs for the grantee and any partner agencies or organizations. Applicants are encouraged to limit such costs to less than 5% of the total proposal costs. Such administrative expenses are the necessary costs incidentally but directly related to the proposal.

Land Purchase/Easement – Not applicable to 319 (h) NPS Grant Program

Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation – For these efforts, differentiate costs between consulting services and/or agency/organization staff costs. Planning costs include: planning efforts, reconnaissance studies, feasibility studies, and preliminary reports. Design and engineering costs include: conceptual, preliminary and final design efforts, geotechnical reports, hydraulic studies, water quality investigations and efforts, and other engineering types of work. Include the costs of bid preparation and processing here. Environmental documentation costs include all efforts involved in the CEQA or NEPA process up to the point of the Notice of Determination, Finding of No Significant Impact, or Record of Decision.

Construction/Implementation – Includes the summary of labor, materials, and equipment purchases and/or rentals. After bids are received these costs will be the actual construction cost awarded to the qualified low bidder. The construction or implementation costs for Pilot Projects should be included here.

Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement – Includes those costs required by a CEQA/NEPA document to offset any potential damages caused by the Proposal. If these costs are included in the grant agreement awarded for construction or implementation of the Proposal, differentiate such costs for purposes of this budget.

Project Summary – The summation of the costs for items (a) through (e) above.

Construction Administration – Includes those costs required to supervise and administer the construction or implementation of the project. Differentiate costs between consulting services and agency staff costs to perform this work.

Other – Includes costs for legal services, license fees, permits, any implementation verification costs, and any monitoring and assessment costs required during the construction/implementation of the Proposal. Do not include monitoring and assessment costs for efforts required after construction/implementation of the Proposal is complete. These costs are considered to be operation and maintenance costs and are not reimbursable.

Construction/Implementation Contingency – Includes any contingency costs for the construction/ implementation of the Proposal. Specify the percentage used for this contingency cost. For all other contingency costs (i.e. design, land purchase, etc.) include those contingencies in the appropriate cost category.

Grand Total [Sum (f) through (i) for each column] – The summation of the costs for items (f) through (i) above.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

G. Scope of Work & Grant Agreement Readiness

Provide a detailed, concise, and specific scope of work to be used for preparing the grant agreement should the Project be selected for funding.

- ☐ Clearly state the purpose for which funding is being requested.
- ☐ Provide a scope of work that is suitable for including in the grant agreement.
- ☐ Describe the specific purpose of each task, starting with an action verb and including details of how, when, and/or where the task will be accomplished. Identify how the Applicant will coordinate with the granting agency.
- ☐ Provide work items within the grant time frame that are complete, detailed, and ready to be implemented. The work items should be supported with the estimates used in the Budget (Section II.E).
- ☐ Include appropriate work items submittals (i.e., documentation of work item progression, progress and final reports).
- ☐ Provide a schedule of work items with deliverable due dates in tabular format and verify that the tasks line up with the tasks in the schedule.

H. Environmental Justice Needs & Issues

Bonus points will be given to Proposals that provide a direct benefit to environmental justice communities or that identify and address environmental justice needs and issues. Provide information about how environmental justice communities will be involved and will directly benefit from the proposed Project, if applicable.

- ☐ Indicate whether this Proposal is eligible for environmental justice points. If yes, the following is required.
- ☐ Provide the demographics of the community in the Project Area.
- ☐ Provide information and justification that supports the request for environmental justice community consideration.
- ☐ Discuss how environmental justice communities within the Project Area have been or will be involved in the planning and/or implementation process.
- ☐ Discuss efforts made to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the Project Area.
- ☐ Document the water supply, water quality, and other environmental needs of the environmental justice communities and how these needs have been or will be addressed.
- ☐ If applicable, describe any negative impacts the Project may have on environmental justice communities.
- ☐ Describe how the Project leverages diverse local efforts and community-based collaborative strategies to involve low-income, minority, or other disadvantaged populations and ensure that benefits are distributed equitably.

I. Education & Outreach

Bonus points may be given to Proposals that provide documentation demonstrating that the Project will incorporate education and outreach efforts.

- ☐ Indicate whether this application is eligible for education and outreach bonus points. If yes, the following is required.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

- ❑ Describe how the Project promotes increased awareness and the adoption of management practices through the use of educational materials, activities, and/or technology transfer from this to other Projects.
- ❑ Describe how the Project proposes a multi-year strategy for education and outreach to interested stakeholders beyond the Project team.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

III. INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (IWMP) PLANNING PROPOSALS SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Not Applicable

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Not Applicable

V. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This section documents submittal requirements that are program-specific that may not be directly covered in the other parts of the application. Each Proposal may receive up to 10 points based on the information provided in this section.

A. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Implementation Program (Clean Water Act [CWA], Section 319[h] Program), Coastal NPS Pollution Program, & NPS Pollution Control Program

- ☐ Include a list of partners that are in place to implement the Project as described in the Proposal.
- ☐ Describe how the Project implements activities necessary to achieve restoration of an impaired water body and/or be in compliance with water quality objectives by 2008.
- ☐ If applicable, describe how the Project enhances comprehensive community-based watershed efforts.
- ☐ If applicable, describe how the Project leverages other funding sources (i.e., Environmental Quality Incentives Program [EQIP]), to accomplish more extensive implementation with measurable environmental results.
- ☐ Describe how the Project tracks management measures implementation. (The purpose of this is to help the State determine progress toward the goal of implementing management measures by 2013.)
- ☐ Identify and describe innovative practices or approaches utilized by the Project that will serve as demonstrations for future implementations.
- ☐ Include activities such as technical transfer and outreach to promote ongoing implementation beyond the current Project Area.
- ☐ Include monitoring within the watershed and/or with statewide water quality assessment.
- ☐ Address whether the Project is part of a watershed-based plan for a water body with a completed total maximum daily load (TMDL).
- ☐ If applicable, describe how the Project integrates Section 319 and Farm Bill funding through coordination between State conservationists and local conservation districts.
- ☐ Discuss how the Project implements appropriate management practices or management measures.
- ☐ Describe how the Project will increase implementation of management practices that will achieve significant water quality improvements.
- ☐ If applicable, for the NPS Implementation Program, describe how the Project will use recycled materials.

APPENDIX I-1: FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

VI. ADDITIONAL APPLICANT INFORMATION/GENERAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS

- ☐ Has the scope of work been modified from what was proposed at the Concept Proposal phase? If yes, please elaborate and briefly discuss the reason for modification or reference the section of the Proposal where documentation is provided.
- ☐ Does this Project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any California Water Boards regulation, permit, or order?
- ☐ Are you aware that, once the Proposal has been submitted to State Water Board, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections offered by law with respect to the application package and project location are waived?
- ☐ Are you aware that grant agreements funded by the State Water Board will specify that acceptance of grant funds constitutes a waiver of any existing or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the Project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the Project.
- ☐ Is the Applicant or was the Applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the Project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the Project.
- ☐ Are you aware that projects funded under the grant program must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?
- ☐ Does the proposed Project include any modification of a river or stream channel? If yes, briefly discuss how these impacts will be mitigated and reference sections of the application where full documentation of this information is provided.
- ☐ Does the proposed plan/project have any implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or interregional water rights issues? Please discuss briefly and if applicable reference sections of the Proposal where additional detail is provided.
- ☐ Are the Applicant and/or cooperating entities in violation of any water right permit requirements including, payment of fees? If yes, please elaborate and discuss the status or progress towards resolving the violation.

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

THIS SECTION INCLUDES THE FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY AND EVALUATION CRITERIA THAT WILL BE USED BY REVIEWERS. THE MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SCORE IS 118 POINTS. THIS SECTION IS BROKEN INTO THE FOLLOWING TABLES, WHICH CONTAIN THE CRITERIA THAT WILL BE USED BY REVIEWERS TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY AND SCORE FULL PROPOSALS.

FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION TABLES		
TABLE	TITLE	
Table 1	Full Proposal Eligibility Review	Eligible/Ineligible
Table 2	Full Proposal General Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Score = 63
Table 3	Not Applicable	
Table 4	Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Implementation Proposals	Maximum Score = 55
Table 5	Full Proposal Program-Specific Evaluation Criteria: 319 (h) NPS Grant Program	Maximum Score = 10
Table 6	Full Proposal Additional Information/General Program Questions (To be completed by reviewers and consensus reviewers.)	Not Scored (For Selection Panel Review and Consideration)

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

SCORING

Unless otherwise noted, each criterion will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 to 10, or 0 to 15 with a 0 being “low” and a 5, 10, or 15 being “high.” Points are then assigned to the Full Proposal for each criterion, as indicated in the Full Proposal Scoring Table below.

FULL PROPOSAL SCORING TABLE			
Score Range			Scoring Rationale
0-5	0-10	0-15	
5	10	15	Criterion is fully addressed and supported by logical rationale.
3-4	7-9	11-14	Criterion is fully addressed but marginally supported by logical rationale.
2	4-6	5-9	Criterion is marginally addressed and marginally supported by logical rationale.
1	1-3	1-4	Criterion is marginally addressed and not supported by logical rationale.
0	0	0	Applicant is not responsive (i.e., the criterion is not addressed and no rationale is presented).

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 1: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY REVIEW		
Criteria	Response/Comments	
<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</p> <p><i>The Eligibility Criteria listed below will be used to screen Full Proposals for all of the funding programs. This table is broken into the following three sections: (i) General Eligibility (A – B); (ii) Program-Specific Eligibility (C – G); and (iii) Eligibility Determination. Each Proposal will be assigned to a State Water Board Review Liaison who will track the progress of the Proposal throughout the evaluation process and serve as the point of contact for questions.</i></p>		
<p>i. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY (A – B)</p> <p><i>Below are general eligibility criteria. State Water Board staff will do this portion of the eligibility review. A “No” response in Sections A – B indicates the Proposal may not be eligible for funding. The Review Liaison should be notified and the Full Proposal should not be scored until the Review Liaison makes a determination.</i></p>		
<p>A. Application Eligibility Screening</p> <p><i>The determination will be based on whether the Proposal meets the eligibility requirements outlined in the Guidelines.</i></p> <p>1. What type of entity is the Applicant?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> Public Agency Local Public Agency State Agency </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 10px;"> Nonprofit Organization Public College Other: (specify) </div> <hr style="width: 150px; margin-left: 0; margin-top: 5px;"/> <p>2. Is the <u>Applicant</u> eligible to receive funding under the selected Program?</p> <p>3. Is the <u>Project</u> eligible for funding under the selected Program?</p> <p>4. Is the <u>Applicant</u> requesting a waiver or reduction of the minimum match requirement as a disadvantaged community?</p> <p>5. Does the budget provide a funding match percentage, which meets or exceeds the minimum amount specified for funding programs in the Guidelines?</p> <p>6. Is the <u>Application</u> complete?</p>	<p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No/Not Applicable</p> <p>Yes/No</p>	
<p>B. Proposal Consistency with Concept Proposal & Responsiveness</p> <p><i>The determination will be based on whether the Full Proposal is consistent with the Concept Proposal and incorporates the Concept Proposal reviewer comments.</i></p> <p>1. Is the Project listed in the Full Proposal consistent with the Concept Proposal and reviewer's comments? Explain your response in the text box provided.</p>		<p>Yes/No</p>

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 1: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY REVIEW	
Criteria	Response/Comments
<p>F. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Implementation Program Proposals [Clean Water Act, Section 319(h) Program] <i>Screening will be based on whether the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific NPS Implementation Program criteria.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Project implement activities to achieve pollutant load reductions consistent with an established total maximum daily load (TMDL) or a TMDL under development? Are the proposed activities consistent with watershed plans that address the USEPA required elements for watershed-based plans, as documented in the completed table (Table F-1)? Will the Project report the following key data, as applicable: sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream banks or acres of wetlands protected or restored? Does the Proposal include provisions for the proper operation and maintenance of the practices that will be implemented in accordance with the National Resource Conservation Services Field Office Technical Guides or other appropriate standards? If applicable, does the Proposal state how the Project will document sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream bank or acres of wetlands protected or restored? 	<p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No/Not Applicable</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No/Not Applicable</p>
<p>G. Not Applicable</p>	

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 1: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY REVIEW	
Criteria	Response/Comments
iii. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION <i>Below are the criteria that will be used to determine if the Full Proposal is eligible. Only eligible Proposals will be scored. Notify the Review Liaison if the Proposal is ineligible and do not score the Proposal until the Review Liaison makes an eligibility determination.</i>	
1. Is the Proposal eligible for the requested funding program? (IF THE RESPONSE IS NO, NOTIFY THE REVIEW LIAISON.)	Yes/No
2. Is the application complete? (IF THE RESPONSE IS NO, NOTIFY THE REVIEW LIAISON.)	Yes/No

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 2: FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Criteria	Maximum Score
GENERAL CRITERIA <i>The General Criteria listed below will be used to evaluate Full Proposals.</i>	
Applicant's responsiveness to Reviewers' Comments <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant adequately addressed the Reviewers comments from the concept proposal phase.</i> How responsive was the applicant to the Concept Proposal reviewers' comments?	10
A. Project Description & Objectives <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Full Proposal is consistent with the Project and the Applicant has adequately described the Project, objectives, and outcomes.</i> 1. Does the Proposal include a detailed description of the Project(s) for which funding is requested? 2. Is a map(s) of the Project Area provided, including the area encompassed by the Project, the location of the Project, disadvantaged communities within the region, and a narrative description? 3. Does the Proposal clearly identify the Project Area (if applicable), and the Project goals and objectives? Does the Proposal describe the manner in which the goals and objectives will be achieved? 4. Does the Proposal discuss important and relevant ecological processes and environmental resources within the watershed area affected by the Project? 5. Does the Proposal include a description of the beneficial uses of the water body(ies) affected, as referenced in the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)? 6. Does the Proposal target specific water quality pollutants or parameters that are critical to the overall condition of the water resources in the area?	10
B. Project Team & Administration <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant has demonstrated the resources, experience, and ability to successfully complete the Project identified in the Proposal.</i> 1. Does the Applicant demonstrate the experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the Project? 2. Does the Applicant describe the partnership agreements, corresponding roles, and institutional structure that will ensure successful completion of the Project? 3. Does the Applicant identify Project leaders within each cooperating entity to ensure consistent, long-term implementation of the Project?	5

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 2: FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>C. Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the Project includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative process.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal include a discussion of how stakeholders: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Were/will be identified; Have/will participate in planning and/or implementation efforts; and Influence decisions made in planning and/or Project implementation? Does the Project describe outreach activities directed towards specific stakeholder groups, as well as stakeholders not involved as Project participants, including disadvantaged communities and environmental justice communities, if applicable? Are there letters of support for the Project from stakeholder groups? Does the Proposal discuss watershed and/or other partnerships developed during the planning process for implementation projects or to be developed during the planning process for planning projects? Does the Proposal describe how the Applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, State, and Federal agencies during implementation of the proposed Project? 	5
<p>D. Financing/Funding Match</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal describes a feasible program of continued financing for implementation, operation, and maintenance of the Project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the budget provide a funding match percentage, which meets or exceeds the minimum amount specified for the Program in the Guidelines? If requesting a waiver or reduction of the funding match, did the applicant provide the necessary information requested in Appendix D, including Exhibit D-1? Does the Project provide a direct benefit to the disadvantaged community(ies)? Does the Proposal include a summary showing the financing mechanisms for all the related elements of the Project? How reliable are the proposed cost-sharing partner commitments? (For example, are the matching funds dependent on some uncertain actions by other entities?) Does the Applicant have the ability to leverage other funds to complete the Project? If applicable, does the Proposal describe the mechanism for ongoing support and financing for the continued operation and maintenance of the implemented Project? 	5

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 2: FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>E. Cost Estimate/Budget <i>Scoring will be based on whether the costs of the proposed Project are well presented and reasonable.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the costs reasonable and relevant to the stated outcomes? 2. Does the Applicant provide a reasonable estimate of costs for each work item (i.e., line item) contained in the Proposal, including planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match? 3. Are all costs directly related to Project implementation (i.e., no overhead)? 4. If applicable, are cost estimates and funding sources provided for those tasks that are not proposed for funding, but are related and important to the success of the proposed Project? 5. Does the Applicant have prior investment(s) in the Project (i.e., money previously spent on planning, design, or environmental compliance)? 	5
<p>F. Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on the reasonableness of the proposed schedule and readiness to proceed.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Applicant provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing for implementation of the Project? 2. Does the Applicant demonstrate how the schedule is consistent with the work plan and identify possible obstacles to Project implementation? 3. Does the Applicant discuss the related elements of the Project, their current status, and how the Applicant plans to ensure the timely completion of these related elements? 	5

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 2: FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>G. Scope of Work & Grant Agreement Readiness</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant presents a detailed and specific scope of work and grant agreement, which adequately documents the proposed Project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Applicant provided a scope of work that is suitable for including in the grant agreement? 2. Does each work item have a specific purpose, starting with an action verb and containing detail of how, when, and/or where it will be accomplished? 3. Are the work items complete, detailed, and ready to be implemented within the grant time frame? 4. Do the work items include appropriate work item submittals (i.e., documentation of work item progression, progress and final reports)? 5. Does the scope of work identify synergies or linkages between and among the work items? 6. Is the purpose for which funding is being requested clear? 7. Is a schedule of tasks provided with deliverable due dates in tabular format and do the tasks line up with the tasks in the schedule? 	10

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 2: FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>H. Environmental Justice Needs & Issues</p> <p><i>Bonus points will be based on the degree that environmental justice communities are involved and will directly benefit from the proposed Project and the extent of efforts to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the Project Area.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Project Area include one or more environmental justice communities? 2. Does the Proposal discuss the demographics of community in the Project Area? 3. Does the Proposal provide information and justification to support the request for environmental justice consideration? 4. Does the Proposal discuss efforts made to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the Project Area? 5. Does the Proposal discuss how environmental justice communities within the Project Area have been/will be involved in the planning and/or implementation process? 6. Does the Proposal document water supply, water quality, and other environmental needs of the environmental justice communities and how these needs have been or will be addressed? 7. Will the proposed Project provide direct benefit to environmental justice communities? 8. Does the proposed Project have any negative impact on environmental justice communities? 9. How well does the Project leverage diverse local efforts and community-based collaborative strategies to involve low-income, minority, or other disadvantaged populations and ensure that benefits are distributed equitably? 	5
<p>I. Education and Outreach</p> <p><i>Bonus points will be based on how well the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal incorporates education and outreach efforts.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Project promote increased awareness and adoption of management practices through the use of educational materials, activities, and/or technology transfer from this to other Projects? 2. Does the Proposal include a multi-year strategy for education and outreach to interested stakeholders beyond the Project team? 	3
Full Proposal GENERAL Evaluation Criteria Maximum Score:	63

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 3: PLANNING PROPOSAL CRITERIA - NOT APPLICABLE	
Criteria	Maximum Score

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 4: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	
Criteria	Maximum Score
IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL CRITERIA <i>The Implementation Project Criteria listed below will be used to evaluate Implementation Project Proposals.</i>	
A. Benefits, Outcomes, & Impacts <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal clearly and fully describes the benefits, outcomes, and impacts of the Project.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal identify the recipients of the benefits resulting from the Project? Do the outcomes relate to the work items identified in the Proposal? Will the Project achieve benefits and significant environmental improvements? Does the Proposal quantify the anticipated environmental benefits (i.e., pollutant load reductions to be achieved by the Project)? Does the Proposal describe how the Project will achieve quantifiable pollutant load reductions? Does the Project contribute to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality objectives? If applicable, will the Project achieve multiple benefits? If applicable, will the Project have benefits beyond the immediate Project Area by demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed activities? Does the Proposal adequately address any potential negative impacts that may result from implementing the Project? If potential negative impacts are identified, does the Proposal identify the proposed mitigation measures? If applicable, how well does the Project incorporate a source reduction/pollution prevention strategy? Is an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources provided? If applicable, does the Proposal identify watershed and/or interregional benefits and impacts from the Project? 	15

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 4: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>B. Plan Consistency & Relation to Local Planning <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Project is consistent with an adopted Plan and whether the Applicant adequately coordinates with agencies and local planning efforts.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the Project identified in an adopted watershed or other Plans (i.e., coho recovery plan) identified in the Bond law? Does the Proposal include documentation of formal adoption of a Plan or a schedule of adoption? (Bonus points will be given for adopted plans and for plans that are recognized by multiple agencies.) 2. For Projects that are part of a Plan, is the Project identified as a priority for implementation within the timeframe of this grant process? 3. If applicable, does the Proposal demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? 	5
<p>C. Technical & Scientific Merit <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Proposal present a technical or scientific basis for achieving the stated objective(s) and outcome(s)? 2. Does the information contained in the Proposal support the technical feasibility of the Project? 3. Are the proposed methods, approaches, technology, and analyses appropriate for the Project? If applicable, are literature citations relating to technical and scientific design of the Project included in the Proposal? 4. Does the Proposal explain how the Project team provides the technical expertise needed for Project implementation? 5. Is the site adequately characterized so that the technology will be effective for the proposed Project? 6. Does the Proposal discuss how Project implementation will be adapted based on new information and data collected? 7. Does the Proposal indicate how to identify and deal with the Project's data gaps? 	15

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 4: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>D. Monitoring & Data Collection <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant presents an adequate monitoring and data collection program.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal describe a monitoring plan that is consistent with the Project's goals, outcomes, and objectives? Will the proposed monitoring activities help to document Project effectiveness (i.e., pollutant load reductions)? Does the monitoring plan identify appropriate parameters and frequency? Are the proposed monitoring activities covered under an existing Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), or will a QAPP have to be developed? How well does the proposed monitoring plan address the requirements of the QAPPs? How qualified are the monitoring partners to meet QAPP requirements? Does the Proposal include mechanisms for appropriate statistical/data analysis? If applicable, does the Proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts? 	5
<p>E. Data Management & Analysis <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant presents an adequate data management and analysis program.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the proposed water quality monitoring plan set a basis for demonstrating, mapping, and tracking long-term water quality improvements (may include the use of geographic information system [GIS] technology)? If applicable, does the Proposal discuss the integration of data into the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) and/or Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program? Does the Proposal identify which databases the Project data will be included in and discuss how the data will be managed and made compatible with existing databases to support statewide data needs? Does the proposed Project provide a framework for data storage and transfer, including water quality and GIS data? With local watershed groups? 	5

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 4: FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>F. Assessment & Performance Measures</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on how well the Applicant demonstrates an adequate assessment program that includes performance measures that will allow a determination of whether the objectives of the Project are met.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the performance measures appropriate and will they adequately demonstrate Project outcomes? 2. Does the Proposal contain specific indicators and/or measures of effectiveness that can be used to evaluate the successful achievement of both the Project and overall watershed goals? 3. Does the Proposal contain a discussion on post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable? 4. Does the Proposal specify the methods that will be used to determine the pollutant load reductions and do they appear to be reasonable? 5. Does the Proposal quantify the predicted load reductions, and are the predicted load reductions reasonable? 6. Are the assessment and performance measures supported by adequate documentation? 7. How well does the Proposal describe how the Project effectiveness will be monitored and assessed (i.e., Project Performance Measures Table)? 	10
Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria – IMPLEMENTATION Proposal Maximum Score:	55

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 5: FULL PROPOSAL PROGRAM-SPECIFIC EVALUATION CRITERIA	
Criteria	Maximum Score
PROGRAM-SPECIFIC CRITERIA <i>The criteria outlined below are Program-specific for evaluation and scoring of Proposals within a given Program. Each Proposal may receive up to 10 points based on its ability to meet the Program-Specific Criteria outlined below.</i>	
A. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Implementation Program (Clean Water Act [CWA], Section 319[h] Program), Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program, & NPS Pollution Control Program <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific criteria outlined below.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal include partners in place to implement the Project as described in the Proposal? Does the Project implement activities necessary to achieve restoration of an impaired water body and/or compliance with water quality objectives by 2008? If applicable, does the Project enhance comprehensive community-based watershed efforts? If applicable, does the Project leverage other funding sources (i.e., Environmental Quality Incentives Program [EQIP]), to accomplish more extensive implementation with measurable environmental results? Does the Project track management measure implementation? (The purpose of this is to help the State determine progress toward the goal of implementing management measures by 2013.) Does the Project utilize innovative approaches that will serve as demonstrations for future implementation? Does the Project include activities such as technical transfer and outreach to promote ongoing implementation beyond the current Project Area? Does the Project include monitoring within the watershed and/or with statewide water quality assessment? Is the Project part of a watershed-based plan for a water body with a completed total maximum daily load (TMDL)? If applicable, does the Project integrate CWA, Section 319 and Farm Bill (i.e., EQIP) funding through coordination between State conservationists and local conservation districts? Does the Proposal identify appropriate management measures and management practices? Will the Project increase implementation of management practices that result in significant water quality improvements? For the NPS Implementation Program, does the Proposal describe how recycled materials will be used in the Project? 	10

APPENDIX I-2: FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 6: FULL PROPOSAL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/GENERAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS	
Criteria	Response/ Comments
<i>The Selection Panel will review the responses to the following questions as part of review of the consensus scores.</i>	
1. Does the Proposal address compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements? Does the reviewer have any concerns regarding environmental compliance requirements for the proposed Project?	
2. Are there modifications/enhancements that should be required for this Proposal as part of the grant agreement if the Project is selected for funding? If yes, explain.	
3. Does this Project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation, permit, or order?	Response taken from Application.
4. Is the proposed completion time reasonable?	
5. Does the reviewer believe the proposed Project is technically and financially feasible?	
6. Does the reviewer believe that the same results could be accomplished at a lower total Project cost?	
7. Do you have any concerns about the Applicant's ability to secure all of the required funding for accomplishing the expected outcomes of this Proposal?	
8. Is the Applicant or was the Applicant a party to a current or pending legal challenge to any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which either requires performance of the Project, or though not required, whose terms or conditions would be satisfied in whole or in part by performance of the Project.	Response taken from Application.
9. What 319(h) NPS Grant Program Priorities does the Proposal meet?	Response taken from Application.
10. Does the proposed Plan/Project have any implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or interregional water rights issues?	Response taken from Application.
11. Is the Applicant and/or a cooperating entity in violation of any water rights permit requirements, including payment of fees?	Response taken from Application.
12. Is the Proposal (e.g., scope of work, budget, schedule, etc.) grant agreement ready? (Reviewers should use the grant agreement readiness checklist, which will be made available on the 319(h) NPS Implementation Grant Program website, as a guide for answering this question.)	
13. Would you recommend the proposed Project for funding? Answer Yes or No. Explain your answer.	
14. Does the reviewer have any concerns about funding this Project? If you answer yes, please explain.	

APPENDIX K

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE PROCESS

I. PURPOSE

This appendix details the steps that applicants must take to comply with environmental review requirements for the 2008 NPS Implementation Grant Program administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Financial Assistance (Division).

The State Water Board is required to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when funding a project. The Division's Regional Programs Unit (RPU) fulfills the State Water Board's responsibility by reviewing the CEQA documents provided by the Lead Agency/Grantee to develop the State Water Board's administrative record and findings.

It is important for the State Water Board to receive the CEQA document during the draft stage for review and comment. This helps ensure that the State Water Board's comments are addressed during the draft stage rather than after the CEQA document has been adopted or certified by the Lead Agency. Grantees are strongly encouraged to submit the draft CEQA document to the Regional Water Board's Grant Manager before, or during the State Clearinghouse review period.

Steps in the RPU review process include:

- 1) Grantee submits the CEQA documents to the Regional Water Board's Grant Manager following the Public Review Period and adoption of the CEQA findings by the Lead Agency.
- 2) RPU staff reviews the CEQA Documentation, including the final CEQA document. (See the following "CEQA Checklist for the Grantee.")
- 3) RPU staff develops an administrative record and State Water Board findings for the funding action.
- 4) Deputy Director or the State Water Board adopts the findings.
- 5) RPU staff notifies the Regional Water Board's Grant Manager when CEQA findings are approved.

State Water Board funded activities subject to CEQA shall not begin until the State Water Board's CEQA findings are finalized and approved.

The CEQA and CEQA Guidelines can be accessed at:

<http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/>

Additional guidance can be obtained from the *CEQA Deskbook 1999 Edition with 2001 Supplement*, published by Solano Press Books. This book provides a step-by-step guide on how to comply with CEQA and may explain information in a more straight-forward manner than the CEQA Guidelines.

Notes: If the grantee is not the Lead Agency under CEQA (i.e., a responsible agency under CEQA that is using another agency's CEQA document), the grantee will need to:

1. Make its own CEQA findings and approve the mitigations measures applicable to the proposed funded project;
2. File the Notice of Determination (NOD) with the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and;
3. Provide the date-stamped copy of the NOD filed with the OPR and a resolution or meeting minutes approving the project and adopting/certifying the CEQA document to the Regional Water Board's Grant Manager.

If the grantee uses a Notice of Exemption (NOE), the grantee files the NOE with the County Clerk of each county in which the project will be located (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15062[c][2]). Since the project is being funded by the State Water Board, the grantee also files the NOE with the OPR. This reduces the statute of limitations from 180 days to 35 days, and notifies other state agencies and the public that the grantee determined the project was exempt from the CEQA requirements. There is no cost for filing an NOE with the OPR.

**California Environmental Quality Act
(CEQA) Checklist for the Grantee
What to Submit to your Water Board's Grant Manager**

If project is covered under a **CEQA Categorical or Statutory Exemption**, submit a copy of the following:

- ☐ **Notice of Exemption** (filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)
- ☐ **List of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and their locations**, if project implements BMPs

If project is covered under a **Negative Declaration**, submit a copy of the following:

- ☐ **Draft and Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration**
(or Mitigated Negative Declaration, if applicable)
 - ☐ Comments and Responses to the Draft
 - ☐ Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (if using a Mitigated Negative Declaration)
- ☐ **Resolution approving the CEQA documents**
 - ☐ Adopting the Negative Declaration
 - ☐ Making CEQA Findings
- ☐ **Notice of Determination** (filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)

If project is covered under an **Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**, submit a copy of the following:

- ☐ **Draft and Final EIR**
 - ☐ Comments and Responses to the Draft
 - ☐ Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP)
- ☐ **Resolution approving the CEQA documents**
 - ☐ Certifying the EIR and adopting the MMRP
 - ☐ Making CEQA Findings
 - ☐ Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations for any adverse impact(s) that cannot be avoided or fully mitigated if project is implemented
- ☐ **Notice of Determination** (filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research)

If EIR is a joint CEQA/National Environmental Policy Act document (EIR/Environmental Impact Statement or EIR/Environmental Assessment), submit the applicable Record of Decision and/or Finding of No Significant Impact.

APPENDIX L

PREPARING PROJECT ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PLANS

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Appendix is to provide background information on Project Assessment and Evaluation Plans (PAEPs) and the Project Performance Measures Tables.

II. BACKGROUND

Monitoring, assessment, and performance measures must be designed so that the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) can ensure that the projects meet their intended goals, achieve measurable outcomes, and provide value to the State of California. The State Water Board requires that all grant funded projects monitor and report project performance with respect to the stated benefits or objectives identified in the Proposal. **Applicants are required to prepare and submit Project Performance Measures Tables, specific to their proposed project, as part of the Full Proposal submittal.** As part of the grant agreement, all grantees must prepare a PAEP, which will include the performance measures tables. Guidance and tools for preparing a PAEP and the accompanying Project Performance Measures Tables can be found on our website ([Appendix B](#)).

The goals of a PAEP are to:

- ❖ Provide a framework for assessment and evaluation of project performance;
- ❖ Identify measures that can be used to monitor progress towards achieving project goals and desired outcomes;
- ❖ Provide a tool for grantees and grant managers to monitor and measure project progress and guide final project performance reporting that will fulfill the grant agreement requirements;
- ❖ Provide information to help improve current and future projects; and
- ❖ Quantify the value of public expenditures to achieve environmental results.

Many projects include multiple activities that will require measurement of several parameters to evaluate overall project performance. Successful applicants must be prepared to demonstrate the success of the project through the development and measurement of the appropriate metrics. These metrics may include water quality measurements; measurement-based estimates of pollution load reductions; acres of habitat restored; feet of stream channel stabilized; additional water supply; improved water supply reliability and flexibility; groundwater level measurements; stream flow measurements; or other quantitative measures or indicators. These and other measures and/or indicators should be selected to fit the performance evaluation needs of the Project.

III. PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASURES TABLES

Project Performance Measures Tables must be submitted as part of the Full Proposal. Applicants may be required to complete multiple Performance Measures Tables depending on what types of activities are proposed. A Project Performance Measures Table should be submitted for each project included in the proposal. Use the following guidance when completing tables for a project:

Project Goals:	Identify the project goals as they relate to activities or items outlined in the proposal/grant agreement.
Desired Project Outcomes:	Identify the measurable results that the project expects to achieve by implementing project activities consistent with the specified goals.
Project Performance Measures:	Appropriate project performance measures that include: (1) Output Indicators representing measures to efficiently track outputs (activities, products, or deliverables); and (2) Outcome Indicators, measures to evaluate change that is a direct result of the work and can be linked through a weight-of-evidence approach to project activities or outputs (e.g. improvements in environmental conditions, awareness, participation, or community, landowner, or local government capacity);
Measurement Tools and Methods:	Methods of measurement or tools that will be used to document project performance (e.g. California Rapid Assessment Method, California Department of Fish and Game Monitoring Protocols for fisheries restoration projects); and
Targets:	Measurable targets that are feasible to meet during the Project period, such as a ninety percent (90%) reduction in invasive species acreage, or fifty percent (50%) reduction in pesticide use within the watershed.

Example Project Performance Measures Tables are provided on the State Water Board's website ([Appendix B](#)). The format of these tables may be used as a template for completing this part of the Full Proposal. The example activities are provided for illustrative purposes only, however, and should be used to guide the identification of appropriate categories and performance measures for the project described in the Full Proposal.